Address to Lizeth’s agenda:

1. NACCHOID crosswalk
2. Can you please indicate the location of your excel sheets on the x drive

X:\PH PBRN National Coordinating Center\Research Projects\NLSPHS\2012 Data\NACCHO 2010 and 2013\NACCHO 2010and2013 ID walk\_updated.xlsx

b.      Can you create a table indicting the following:

                   i.      The number of observations with same ID from 2010 and 2013: 2095

                   ii.      The number of observation that did not match: 12

                   iii.      What criteria you used to make decisions:

Matched based on city, state name. For those that did not match, used nacho profile data from webscrapping and google to identify the name of the LHD

2)      ARF to NACCHO

a.       Can you please create a table indicting the following:

                       i.      How many observations in the sub-county category

                       ii.      How many observations in the single-county category

                       iii.      How many observations in the sub-county category

geographic |

jurisdiction | Freq. Percent Cum.

-------------+-----------------------------------

city | 272 13.60 13.60

city-county | 4 0.20 13.80

county | 1,467 73.35 87.15

multi-city | 74 3.70 90.85

multi-county | 183 9.15 100.00

-------------+-----------------------------------

Total | 2,000 100.00

                         iv.      How many dropped out

None, rather we need to add those that were in our 1998 sample but did not respond to NACCHO 2013 profile survey

                          v.      Decision rules you used
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NACCHO-ARF linked data at LHD level

C:\Users\LRTI222\Dropbox\Data\NLSPHS\Analysis\data\NACARFAVGunique.dta

Description of the steps

* Splitting the dataset by type of jurisdictions
* Importing nacho 2013 boundary files
* Linking naccho data with the naccho boundary file to get FIPS code
* 1:m match merge data sets from naccho and nacchobound
* Using zip codes with county fips file to impute missing county\_fips in naccho file such that each nacchoid will have its county fips linked
* Based on county fips, linking naccho data with AHRF data
* For each nacchoid we identify max, minimum of cbsa, rucc and urbinfc variables. This will be useful is assigning rural/urban code for multicounties jurisdictions. Presence of at least one urban county makes the multicounty jurisdiction "Urban”
* Computing mean values for ARF variables for multicounties jurisdiction grouped by nachoid; mean(varname) will not account for the missing data when calculating mean
* Removing duplicates based on nacchoid. This will keep those observation at LHD level with mean ARF values for multicounty jurisdictions

1. Descriptive stats on ARF/NACCHO linkage

Do file: X:\xDATA\NLSPHS 2014\Analysis\AnalyticalFiles\data\Quality Checks.do

Please refer to the stata output file: X:\xDATA\NLSPHS 2014\Analysis\AnalyticalFiles\ QC\_Output\_NACARFAVG.pdf

c.       Please upload the DO files for the following to GitHub

                        i.      DO files used for merging the data to NACCHO or ARF

3)      NLSPHS

a.       Syntax for creating the NLSPHS from the raw data

Please refer to the flow-chart presented as table and its detail above.

1. Upload DO files used for creating the calculated variables in NLSPHS to GitHub

4)      For entire merge- zip code

a.       Table with the following:

                   i.      How many observations have a zip code

                   ii.      How many observations with missing zip code

Final data (NLSPHSNACCHOARFAll4Waves\_wts\_peer\_rurb7.dta) with updated zip code is located in

X:\xDATA\NLSPHS 2014\Analysis\AnalyticalFiles\data\

. count

9,307

count if zip\_rec=="" & survresp!=.

5

list nacchoid state2014 yearsurvey if zip\_rec=="" & survresp!=.

+--------------------------------+

| nacchoid sta~2014 yearsu~y |

|--------------------------------|

242. | 1998 |

1892. | VA004 VA 1998 |

4228. | 2006 |

7146. | 2012 |

8408. | VA004 VA 2014 |

+--------------------------------+

There is county\_fips code assigned to each LHDs.

. list nacchoid state2014 yearsurvey if county\_fips=="" & survresp!=.

+--------------------------------+

| nacchoid sta~2014 yearsu~y |

|--------------------------------|

242. | 1998 |

1892. | VA004 VA 1998 |

4228. | 2006 |

5202. | ZZ001 2012 |

7146. | 2012 |

|--------------------------------|

8408. | VA004 VA 2014 |

+--------------------------------+

                  iii.      Decision rules applied

For those LHDs with missing zip codes we used following datasets in this order to address missingness

NACCHOID for each waves

NLSPHS complete data for each waves:

If the same zip code is consistently occurring in any 3 waves then impute the missing zip code to be the same for the remaining wave

If the zip code is same for ’98 and ’14 then use the same zip code for ’06 and ‘12

If the zip code is same for ’98 and ’12 then use the same zip for ‘06

If the zip code is same for ’06 and ’14 then use the same zip for ‘12

Based on the Name of the LHD, city and state google for the remaining missing zip codes