Health Impact Assessment

An emerging tool for integrating public health considerations into land use planning decisions

Jennifer Lucky, MPH Human Impact Partners

New Partners for Smart Growth Conference Thursday, February 3, 2011 Charlotte, NC



Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.

- World Health Organization

HIA Definition



Health Impact Assessment

A combination of procedures, methods and tools that systematically judges the potential, and sometimes unintended, effects of a policy, plan, program or project on the health of a population and the distribution of those effects within the population. HIA identifies appropriate actions to manage those effects.

International Association for Impact Assessment, 2006

How does the proposed project, plan, policy

Housing Air quality Noise Safety Social networks Nutrition Parks and natural space Private goods and services **Public services** Transportation Livelihood Water quality Education Inequities

affect



and lead to health outcomes

HIA Purpose



Through HIA report and communications

Judge health effects of a proposed project, plan or policy Highlight health disparities Provide recommendations Shape public decisions & discourse Make health impacts more explicit



Through the HIA process

Engage & empower community Recognize lived experience Build relationships & collaborations Build consensus



| Screening | Determines the need and value of a HIA |
|-----------------|--|
| Scoping | Determines which health impacts to evaluate, methods for analysis, and a workplan |
| Assessment | Provides:1) a profile of existing health conditions2) evaluation of potential health impacts |
| Recommendations | Provide strategies to manage identified adverse health impacts |
| Reporting | Includes: 1) development of the HIA report 2) communication of findings & recommendations |
| Monitoring | Tracks: 1) impacts on decision-making processes and the decision 2) impacts of the decision on health determinants |



Comprehensive / Specific / Transit-Oriented Development Plans

Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project Pittsburg Avenue Railroad Specific Plan An Existing Conditions Report of the East Palo Alto Ravenswood Business District Planning Humboldt County General Plan Update

<u>Housing Projects</u> Jack London Gateway development South Los Angeles housing redevelopment San Francisco public housing redevelopment

State / Local Policies

I-710 expansion in California Vehicle miles traveled legislation in Oregon Paid sick days legislation in California, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire Benton County Accessory Dwelling Unit Policy

Humboldt County GPU HIA

Proposal

Update Humboldt County's General Plan, including development scenarios to accommodate future growth in the county



Board of Supervisors Public Health Branch County Planning Department The California Endowment Human Impact Partners HumPAL (community organization)



Alternative A

"Focused growth" All new units built in areas with existing infrastructure 6,000 units over 25 years

Alternative B

Build primarily in areas with existing infrastructure Some expansion to areas outside city centers 12,000 units (6,000 urban/6,000 non-urban)

Alternative C

Requires expansion of infrastructure Allows new housing in outlying areas 18,000 units (6,000 urban/12,000 non-urban) Clearly defined decision to be made Decision will impact health Public health involvement invited Resources available Variety of stakeholders interested





Humboldt Scoping

Process

Led by Public Health, HumPAL, and HIP

Conducted three focus groups with ~50 participants

35 community health indicators used to assess 3 alternatives

Healthy housing Safe and sustainable transportation Environmental stewardship Public infrastructure Public safety/Social cohesion Healthy economy







Existing Conditions

In Humboldt County, VMT = 27 miles/person/day (2006) California VMT = 24 miles/person/day

VMT affects health

Collisions, walking/biking, proximity to goods and services, social cohesion, global warming

Disparities

Seniors may be unable/unwilling to drive Low-income people may not have access to cars or may need to spend large percent of income on driving

VMT: Average vehicle miles traveled per person per day

Alternative A (baseline)

Reduced individual travel expenses and time Increased transit, walking, and biking



Alternative B

200 million more miles driven in the county annually

Alternative C 400 million miles more





Alternative A

Most positive health impacts overall and requires fewest health-related mitigations

Alternative B

Changes current health outcomes least

Alternative C

Most negative health impacts overall and requires greatest number of health-related mitigations



Examples of Transportation-related Recommendations

Encourage employer-based incentives for transit Increase public education about public transit Raise priority of non-motorized modes of transport Collect data about pedestrian and bicycle use Establish pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools



No decision yet on General Plan Update

- Recommendations included in Circulation and Housing Elements
- HIA included as appendix to EIS
- Built collaboration between planning & public health agencies
- Built awareness about health and land use among elected officials, general public, planners, community groups
- Other counties interested in using the approach
- Proposed Humboldt Port expansion project will include an HIA

HIA of ADU Policy in Benton County, OR



Accessory Dwelling Unit

on property detached living quarters "granny flat" or "studio unit"



Benton County code does not currently allow ADU's

County Comprehensive Plan includes goal to develop standards for ADU's.

Have the potential to promote health, especially for persons with medical hardships



HIA completed collaboratively by County Planning and Health Departments to identify possible health impacts of ADUs and to assess potential policy options

potential policy options

- 1) no policy change
- 2) restriction of current rules;
- 3) allow dependent accessory dwelling units
- 4) allow independent accessory dwelling units
- 5) allow independent accessory dwelling units in urban growth boundary areas only



18 indicators of health assessed for each policy proposal

Positive impacts:

living spaces for ill, disabled, or aging persons near family members or caregivers

affordable housing for low and moderate income persons and small households

living situations for "familybased" or multi-generational housing

additional income for homeowners

Negative impacts:

development of units in locations far from basic amenities and services

development of units is places without appropriate public transportation

development in rural areas where auto-dependence is necessary and pedestrian and bicycle activity in limited

Summary of Policy Impacts



| Option 1 (no policy change) | No effect |
|---|-----------------|
| Option 2 (restriction of current rules) | Positive impact |
| Option 3 (dependent ADUs) | Positive impact |
| | |
| Option 4 (independent ADUs) | Negative impact |

Mitigations:

- 1) Residents of ADUs must be the homeowner, relative or caretaker of the homeowner
- 2) Units cannot be offered as a rental
- 3) The policy will be reviewed for unexpected impacts several years after adoption
- 4) A "cap" of units permitted annually will be established and can be modified after the initial policy review.

EPA RBD Planning HIA

¼ of the land acreage in EPA Traditionally industrial area Some environmental quality concerns Last undeveloped land in EPA

East Palo Alto is a "community of concern" 30% or more of households earn below 200% of poverty level 70% or more of persons in households are people of color





Partners and Collaborators







ADUNDED 1856

San Mateo County Health System

Funded by



Screening



Development decisions will impact health and health disparities

Mayor of EPA committed to including health in decision-making

Public health invited to participate

Resources available

Variety of stakeholders interested

Area Plan in development; City seeking input



EPA RBD Scoping



Process

Series of meetings with coalition of community participants

6 chapters to address impact of RBD plans on:

Jobs and livelihood Safe and sustainable transportation Neighborhood completeness Environmental quality Healthy housing Social cohesion





Existing Conditions

89.9% of intersections = poor or unsuitable 11.2% of street segments = poor or unsuitable

Pedestrian quality affects health

Collisions, walking/biking, proximity to goods and services, social cohesion

Disparities

- Low-income people may not have access to cars; need to walk more
- Upkeep is not as good in lowerincome neighborhoods of EPA



Environmental Quality



Existing Conditions

Of 149 land parcels in redevelopment area, approximately 50 are zoned for industrial use, and 60% of industrial parcels have some level of hazardous waste contamination

Current water and sewer infrastructure is inadequate and in need of improvement

There is little air quality monitoring data at the local level in EPA

Environmental quality and health

Living near contaminated land can pose serious threats to health, especially for vulnerable populations

Exposure to environmental hazards is a major concern for residents in EPA





Implement pedestrian improvements equally in all neighborhoods

Traffic calming in most dangerous intersections

Clean-up and remediation of contaminants necessary for RBD to be available for uses that meet interests and needs of the community

Consider the development of a "downtown", pedestrian friendly area with retail in the RBD

New transportation developments associated with the RBD should help residents get to needed retail and services

EPA RBD Reporting



150 page reportIntroduction6 detailed analysis reports

Reviewed by community partners, San Mateo County Health Systems before release

Shared with other local organizations and Redevelopment Agency