



Oregon Environmental Public Health Tracking

800 N.E. Oregon Street #640

Portland, OR 97232-2162

Phone: 971-673-0977

www.oregon.gov/DHS/ph/epht

Oregon Technical Advisory Group (OTAG)

Thursday, September 9, 2010 9-11 a.m.

Portland State Office Building, Conference Room 1A-80

Co-chairs: Gail R. Shibley, OPHD Office of Environmental Public Health Administrator

Kerri Nelson, DEQ MSD Administrator (*not in attendance*)

Staff:

Jae Douglas	R&E Section Manager, EPHT Principal Investigator (<i>not in attendance</i>)
Curtis Cude	EPHT Program Manager
Dan Rubado	EPHT Epidemiologist
Daniel Costantino	EPHT GIS/Research Analyst
Marina Counter	EPHT Research Analyst
Tara Chetock	EPHT Outreach and Education
Karen Worden	EPHT Administrative Specialist
Courtney Sullivan	EPHT IT Project Manager/Business Analyst
Shawna Job	EPHT IT Senior Systems Analyst
John Dougherty	EPHT PDES Program Evaluator
Won Kim	DEQ Data Exchange Specialist

Meeting Attendees ~ September 2010	
Don Austin	OHSU, OPHA
Michael Donchi	OPHD OIS
Karen Girard	OPHD ODPE
Joyce Grant-Worley	OPHD CHS
Renee Hackenmiller-Paradis	OEC
Anna Harding	OSU Pub Hlth
Toby Harris	Washington County, CLHO
Gregg Lande	DEQ AQ
Rick Leiker	OPHD Lead
Dave Leland	OPHD Drinking Water
Richard Leman	OPHD ODPE
Ken Rosenberg	OPHD OFH
Lila Wickham	Multnomah County
Jeffrey Stocum	

Link to be included per email from Curtis.

<http://www.co.washington.or.us/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/2010-2015-consolidated-plan.cfm>

9:15 Welcome and Introductions

Gail R. Shibley

9:25 Built Environment

Dan Rubado, Daniel Costantino

PowerPoint presentation: CDC Carcinogenic Emissions Indicator Proposal 4/9/2010

Indicator Description

The indicators were based originally on feedback from members of OTAG and other sources. Choices were supported by literature on health in the community and on statewide sources of data available.

Q&A Session was held prior to the presentation:

Q: Air quality: Do the regions, as you map them, line up with DEQ air quality and air toxics? Is there a reason that air quality wouldn't be important as a measure in a healthy community?

A: We do have a measure we are looking at: proximity to busy roadways and the associated pollution plume. We will raise some questions related with the group. We just need some sort of information; raw data that we can use that covers more than one of these urban areas. If you know of a data source state wide that we can tap into, please tell us about it.

Q: How much residential use is there in an area?

A: Every planning commission has a map of every square mile. They have information on zoning, but this may not be related to actual land use. The statewide tax lot database is not completed yet.

Q: Where is the tree canopy?

A: PSU is calculating tree coverage and configuration for a research study, which currently includes one area of Portland. This is done with the use of aerial photography and then classified based on the color spectrum to identify the tree canopy. The data are expensive to produce using this process.

Q: Have we looked at the comprehensive plans developed through the Department of Land & Conservation Development (DLCD)?

A: That would be doable, but we are steering clear of what is planned, as opposed to what is real and is actually there.

Q: What is the relationship of EPHT in regard to ongoing connections with DLCD?

A: There is no current relationship with DLCD. We have been working locally with the County Health Departments. Gail Shibley strongly encouraged EPHT to develop a relationship with DLCD, and in-house with Michael Heumann and Mel Kohn who are leads on this project.

Measures not included in Pilot List

- No data source: Sidewalks, access to recreation facilities, land use mix, noise exposure, tobacco outlets, tree canopy
- Unclear theoretical basis: roadway air pollution, cancer risk attributable to air pollution, respiratory illness risk attributable to air pollution
- Provide insufficient information: housing overcrowding, county crime rates

Access to Facilities

- **Healthy Food:** The walking distance is along the street network now. Consequently, it is a measure of access to healthy food and physical access:

Q: How do you define Healthy food retailers?

A: We compared the grocery store data set, the employment data set, and food stamp datasets. Larger stores will have a wider range of fruits/vegetables.

Q: What about WIC

A: WIC is not as wide a network as food stamps. Farmers markets are not captured in this measure. Many people have stated they would like to see farmers markets as a separate measure. Healthy food and community cohesion merits it being a separate measure.

Q: are convince stores on the list?

A: yes

Q: Do snack retailers sell fruits and vegetables?

A: It actually is a provision, but it is pretty lenient.

Q: Has ODA been considered as a data source?

A: We contacted them, but the data was not available.

Q: What about Liquor Stores?

A: We considered including other facilities, but where do you draw the line of a bar, tavern, or restaurant. Consequently, we chose to just use the liquor stores.

Comment from attendee:

What is the specific definition of convince store? You have to be careful when you gather convince store data because some are ethnic markets that are supplying food to people.

Q: Is there a centralized data base that would have licensure for every stores selling tobacco?

A: The only ones I know of are liquor stores which are separated out as being just liquor. There is no good way to separate this out as a good asset or bad asset in stores outside of liquor stores. Grocery stores sell beer and wine, but we consider these stores a positive thing.

To compare OR with WA health contribution of liquor stores might be an interesting analysis to present to the Legislature. We are currently getting comparable measures with WA/OR and a few other EPHT states as well. Could this possibly be a student thesis project? Positive effects and negative affects could be looked at separately. Lottery tickets could also be looked at.

- **Parks and Trails**

Includes percentage of population, city, county state parks, and trails. Adding in schools is being considered.

Many playgrounds are accessible to the general public.

- **Public Transit**

looking at 1/3 mile rather than 2/3 to access distance. This is due to the fact that transit riders not only have to walk to the transit stop, but from their ending stop to their destination.

Defining Access within “Walking distance”

Q: If there is a bikeway or transecting sidewalk, can we add this information into the network?

A: We are working on that. Freeways will be excluded.

Overall Neighborhood Access

Street connectivity:

Q: There might be value of showing what is local and include the walking distance.

A: We are not looking at rural areas in this first brush. If we extend into rural areas there will be different measures. If we expand into WA and there may then be more consistency across states. We may come up code and then share with others states:

Q: If we include freeways, can we assume that all other streets will have sidewalks?

A: No. This is not looking at sidewalks; it is just looking at streets.

Q: Are we comfortable with the definitions and

A: Good enough to try.

Dan Rubado

Geographic Scale Issue 1 - Census tracts and block groups map

Dan posed the question to the group, “ Is it better to be more consistent with our scale and have every scale look at the whole or smallest geographic unit possible?”

Responses:

The smallest geographic unit possible, and then you can aggregate up.

The ability to aggregate block groups is important if you want to look at events.

Q: Is it going to become a recourse issue in the amount of time that is available?

A: Slight

Q: What is the quality? Is there enough information in a block group to figure out something meaningful to go below census tract?

A: Yes. The major goal is community empowerment. This is aggregated data, not block data. We are working for continuity between the two efforts.

Geographic Scale Issue 2 – County subdivisions as larger sub-county areas

Q: In cases where the measures are unreliable at the census tract level, but we still want to explore sub-county differences, we propose using Census County Subdivisions.

A: This seems fine.

Toby Harris: Check out the Washington County Opportunity Maps [here](#).

9:50 Technical Update: IRMA

Courtney Sullivan

Content Areas:

User testing has been scheduled for mid September. In addition, the Environmental Health class at OSU under the direction of Anna Harding will be doing pilot testing. The initial release of the application will follow on Sept. 30 as a soft launch. The broad release will take place when the final design has been implemented.

Suppression:

We have employed both primary and secondary suppression in the application.

Q: What is the difference?

A: Primary suppresses value in order to protect confidently.

Secondary suppression is to insure that you are not able to back calculate primary suppressed values. We are indicating data that is unreliable, with grey italics, when there are less than 10 case counts per selected geography/age group/sex.

10:15 Outreach: Social Media Plan

Tara Chetock

At the Oregon Public Health Association conference to be held in Corvallis, OR in October, Tara Chetock and Curtis Cude will demo the EPHT portal and highlight social media experiences with the Oregon EPHT Facebook page.

The Oregon EPHT Facebook page is in the final stages of approval and will go live within the next several weeks. Outreach efforts to promote the Facebook page have been outlined in the Oregon EPHT Social Media Outreach Plan and will be implemented immediately upon approval. All OTAG members have been encouraged to “like” the Oregon EPHT Facebook page to stay connected to current work within the Oregon and National EPHT program.

Experiences learned from Oregon EPHT social media efforts will be documented and shared with other organizations who seek information on establishing a social media presence.

Comment:

An attendee expressed disagreement with the Social Media outreach approach.

It was expressed that EPHT should be doing outreach on environmental health issues, rather solely focusing on one grant funded program. It was further stated that the history of the EPHT program is that it exists for a discreet period of time only and is grant funded and temporary. It was stated that we should be interested in an Oregon Environmental Health page that would exist permanently rather than have an EPHT social media page.

Responses:

1. In the Environmental Health offices there are various programs investigating the use of social networking sites within their own programs and using it in separate ways.
2. Gail Shibley stated that we do not currently have the resources to create an Oregon Environmental Health social media page, and that there could be further discussions on this topic.
3. There are currently other EPHT grantee states that have their own Facebook pages and Oregon EPHT sees the creation of a Facebook page as a means to further collaborate with grantee states.

4. The EPHT webpage designates a much larger audience than just grantees and perhaps this is not the most efficient way to connect with them.

Gail Shibley commented that both sides of the issue were right, and that further discussion should be pursued between Jae Douglas and managers within the Research & Education Section (R&E), and with all of the Public Health Educators within the R&E section.

Curtis Cude –OTAG meeting structure upgrades incorporated into today’s meeting

1. We gave you more information prior to the meeting, and sent you materials to be better prepared
2. The agenda was sent out to you several weeks prior to the meeting, stating the topics, purpose and who would be presenting.
3. We made sure that the presentations were linked to the agenda.
4. We provided links to background information so you would be prepared for the Q&A session.
5. We included questions on the advance agenda so you would be prepared for specific feedback.
6. We took out the topic area of Climate Change, due to time restraints.
7. We included WebEx availability in addition to AT&T call-in availability.
8. We changed the room environment arrangement to allow participants to sit closer together which was more conducive to verbal interaction.

Participants were asked for feedback on these changes, and to suggest any additional changes needed. Comments made were:

1. Would like to have more context of what is going on in EPHT at the national level, and more information on what other states are doing.
2. Different people listen different ways, and it would be good to have the Powerpoint presentation available in paper copy and to send it out prior to the meeting.
3. The room environment was cozy, and allowed a more welcoming environment which resulted in it being easier to follow the presentations.
4. All of the meeting structure changes and improvements were valuable.

Closing comments

Gail Shibley stated that we need to be mindful that the number of EPHT staff members attending OTAG meetings outnumbers the number of Technical Advisory Group members attending. We need Advisory Group members to attend these meetings so that we can get the benefit of their feedback. EPHT needs to query OTAG members about distance, relevance, and context issues and find ways to increase participation in the meetings.

Gregg Lande commented that he would like see more DEQ people involved in OTAG, and suggested that Gail Shibley and Kerri Nelson talk about this. It would be helpful to have peer to peer contact and discussion of what transpired in today’s OTAG meeting.

Gail further commented that we need to be sensitive to the fact that programs come and go, and that the sustainability of a program is tied to how useful it is, and that supporters are needed. The key to a surveillance system is the benefit in how it is used. The earlier you can get someone/something using the system, the better sustainability it has. The “so what” factor is of primary importance to Legislators, in order to increase awareness and identify relevance and utility is where the rubber meets the budgetary road. We need to consider what the sustainability will be in four, five or ten years from now. The program may be well designed, but what is the

sustainability?

Karen Girard stated that a lot of customers for EPHT are within the PSOB building. Making the connection to the program is critical. EPHT can augment surveillance and data that other programs within the PSOB building provide and extend their services to these programs and collaborate with them.