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Background and Purpose

The Site Assessment Section (SAS) of the Environmental Health Investigations Branch (EHIB), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), conducts public health activities at hazardous waste sites in the State of California through a cooperative agreement with the federal Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). SAS carries out public health activities, which may include exposure assessments and investigations, health education and community involvement, technical assistance to local, state or federal agencies or community groups, and health studies when feasible. With no regulatory power, the impact that SAS makes in a community are through its public health protective recommendations to the regulatory agencies overseeing cleanup or operations and efforts in community participation and health education.

Since 2006, SAS has been providing its stakeholders the opportunity to dialogue about environmental public health in the context of a roundtable. We have brought together individuals from public health departments, local, state, and federal agencies and community-based organizations, to: increase their access to resources and experts that can assist them; provide a forum for cross-communication; and catalyze local efforts addressing environmental public health. The purpose for these roundtables is twofold: 1) to facilitate learning and sharing about environmental public health concerns relevant among communities, agencies, and SAS staff, and 2) to provide a forum for feedback and direction to the SAS group from communities and agencies.

Timeline of Stakeholders Roundtables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Prioritizing &amp; Meeting Community Needs at Hazardous Waste Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Methamphetamine Laboratories &amp; Facilities Emitting Hazardous Chemicals in the Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Land Use Planning &amp; Environmental Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Health Impact Assessments &amp; Long-Term Stewardship of Hazardous Waste Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Water Quality &amp; Disease Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Healthy Housing and Indoor Air Quality, Navigating Environmental Health Agencies and Understanding and Approaching Unengaged Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: funding challenges prevented SAS from conducting a roundtable in 2009 and 2012; however, in 2011 instead of organizing a roundtable, SAS helped EHIB host a symposium for promotores (community health workers) from across the state.
Stakeholder Roundtable 2014

The roundtable was held in Los Angeles, California on January 16, 2014. During this roundtable, 23 participants were convened to learn about healthy housing and indoor air quality, navigating environmental health agencies and understanding and approaching unengaged communities. Topics were selected based on suggestions made by roundtable participants and perceived utility of topics by roundtable organizers. For a copy of the agenda please refer to Appendix A.

At the beginning of the roundtable, Dr. Gabriele Windgasse, Chief of SAS, provided participants with a general background and purpose of the roundtables as well as an overview of SAS in the organizational structure of CDPH. To see a copy of Dr. Windgasse’s Power Point Presentation please see Appendix B.

Healthy Housing and Indoor Air Quality

Dr. Rick Kreutzer, Chief of the Division of Environmental and Occupational Disease Control in CDPH spoke about housing issues, common indoor air pollutants, and ways to improve our indoor air quality and led an interactive discussion aimed at identifying indoor pollutants. Dr. Kreutzer also discussed the housing stock in the state and the exposure pathways that link indoor air pollutants to health and disease. His Power Point Presentation is provided in Appendix C.

Take Home Messages

1) Humans have three basic human needs: food, water, shelter.
2) Housing can be described using three overlapping frames: a consumer product, a public good and as a basic human right.
3) Housing stock in California is varied, with less than a 10th of it unoccupied.
4) Indoor air quality is impacted by pollutants that are outside of the home (e.g. freeways).
5) Indoor air quality is important because we spent most of our days indoors.
6) Causes of indoor air contamination include consumer products, toxins from outside, pets, combustion products, VOCs, second hand smoke, asbestos, formaldehyde, flame-retardant chemicals, radon and pesticides, among others.
# Unanswered Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What percent of air is exchanged between units in multi-unit housing?</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: <a href="http://publichealthlawcenter.org/sites/default/files/resources/tclc-syn-secondhand-2010_0.pdf">http://publichealthlawcenter.org/sites/default/files/resources/tclc-syn-secondhand-2010_0.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percent of Californians smoked 50 years ago?</td>
<td>Estimated to be approximately 43% in 1965.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When was asbestos outlawed in the building of homes?</td>
<td>Bans of certain home applications of asbestos began in 1973. A complete history of federal legislation on asbestos can be found here: <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/asbestos/us-federal-bans-asbestos">http://www2.epa.gov/asbestos/us-federal-bans-asbestos</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does formaldehyde have a half-life?</td>
<td>Yes, it is 30-50 minutes. More details about formaldehyde can be found here: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/teach/chem_summ/Formaldehyde_summary.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/teach/chem_summ/Formaldehyde_summary.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Who Could I Ask For Help: Navigating the Government Maze Of Environmental Health Agencies

Dr. Marilyn Underwood, Environmental Health Director of Contra Costa County spoke about federal and state environmental regulation, organization of US EPA and its state counterpart, organization of municipality and county environmental health organization. Dr. Underwood led an activity in which roundtable attendees identified the agencies (federal, state or county) responsible for addressing specific environmental health concerns. Several participants shared environmental health concerns in their communities and inquired about what agencies would be responsible for addressing the issue. Dr. Underwood’s Power Point Presentation is provided in Appendix D.
Take Home Messages

1) Much of environmental regulation in the United States has formed in reaction to a serious event.
2) Federal agencies frequently have counterparts at the state, county and municipality level.
3) Specific environmental health issues may be under the purview of multiple health agencies.
4) There is wide variability in how organizations function and are structured.
5) At the moment, there is no unified resource to help individuals determine which environmental health agency is responsible for addressing their problem.
6) When roadblocks are encountered interacting with agencies, it can be helpful to bring in federal agencies (if they are not the source of the roadblock) or to partner with academic institutions.
7) Depending on the situation, all three branches of government can be brought in to address the concerns of a community.

Open Forum Discussion

During the lunch period there was an open discussion forum, in which roundtable participants interacted with each other. There were several community representatives who posed specific questions to representatives of environmental health agencies. One recurring theme in the discussion was the accuracy of information provided by the government. Specifically, it was unclear to participants how Superfund designations were made or revoked and what the role of corporations was in obscuring information from the public. Community members learned that all information on Superfund sites is publicly available. Even emails pertaining to these sites are available through the Freedom of Information Act request (FoIA) request. Additionally, a criterion for Superfund designation was clarified. Only few documents cannot be released to the public: for example, documents that contain confidential/medical/or personally identifiable information need to be redacted before released to the public.
## Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information on Superfund Sites</td>
<td><a href="http://www.epa.gov/superfund/about.htm">http://www.epa.gov/superfund/about.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## A Community Advocate’s Perspective on Navigating the Government Maze

Sherry Padgett shared her personal journey that led her to become a community advocate with the Richmond Southeast Shoreline Area Community Advisory Group. Sherry owns and operates a business across the street from the former Stauffer Chemical Company site in Richmond. She believes this led to serious health consequences for her and her employees because the site had been used for illegal hazardous waste dumping and the former chemical factory that was on the site had been demolished, leading to harmful exposure for the surrounding community. Sherry undertook a journey to uncover what had occurred that the site. This resulted in a long process of navigating through various agencies. Once she received answers, she began the process of community organizing to prevent construction on the site and mandate proper clean up. The roundtable attendees were moved by Sherry’s story and inquired about specific hurdles she faced. Her Power Point Presentation is provided in Appendix E.

## Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For more on Sherry’s quest</td>
<td><a href="http://richmondeconfidential.org/2012/12/06/one-womans-quest-to-clean-up-100-years-of-chemical-waste/">http://richmondeconfidential.org/2012/12/06/one-womans-quest-to-clean-up-100-years-of-chemical-waste/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Understanding and Approaching Unengaged Communities

Héctor E. Alcalá, a doctoral student from UCLA Fielding School of Public Health spoke about theories that can be used to explain why communities become engaged or not. He also presented examples of communities that have had varying degrees of engagement and led the roundtable in a discussion to explain the level of engagement. Roundtable participants shared other reasons communities can be unengaged and provide concrete examples from their own experiences. His Power Point Presentation is provided in Appendix F.
Take Home Messages

1) Communities and individuals are motivated to act by internal and external factors.
2) We should refrain from blaming communities for being unengaged; instead we should identify barriers that impede their engagement and work to ameliorate these.
3) Trust of government institutions is a major barrier to overcome.
4) Some communities have greater access to resources, power, education etc., making it easier for them to engage.
5) Some issues are easier to become engaged about.
6) Communities can become engaged in a way that is harmful to health, especially if they perceive a health hazard that has not been scientifically verified or one that has been debunked. However, it is important to remember that communities frequently identify legitimate concerns before government or scientists do.
7) Attempts to increase engagement require an understanding of the issue and an understanding of the audience.

Closing Remarks

This roundtable provided stakeholders an opportunity to learn about the role of CDPH’s Division of Environmental and Occupational Disease Control in identifying and addressing indoor air pollutants. The event also provided community members with the skills to identify air pollutants in their own communities.

Roundtable participants also learned about the large number of environmental health agencies in the state. They learned about the unique role of each agency in addressing environmental health concerns. Participants also heard a first hand account that detailed the difficulties in interfacing with agencies and ways to overcome roadblocks along the way. Finally, participants discussed ways to engage communities in response to environmental health concerns.

SAS will continue striving to provide these types of learning opportunities to their stakeholders as well as provide additional tools and resources that increase community capacity and protect public health.

To read a summary of the feedback provided by roundtable participants please see Appendix G.

For a list of roundtable participants please see Appendix H.
Appendix A: Agenda
## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 8:45</td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 – 9:15</td>
<td><strong>Welcome &amp; Introductions</strong></td>
<td>Tivo Rojas-Cheatham., MPH, Chief of Community Participation and Education Section, and Nancy Palate, Health Educator, Environmental Health Investigations Branch, CDPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:25</td>
<td><strong>Background &amp; Purpose of Roundtable</strong></td>
<td>Gabriele Windgasse DrPH., Chief, Site Assessment Section, CDPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25 – 10:30</td>
<td><strong>Indoor Air Quality: Overlooked Concerns</strong></td>
<td>Rick Kreuter, MD., Chief of the Division of Environmental and Occupational Disease Control, CDPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 10:45</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Who Could I Ask For Help: Navigating The Government Maze Of Environmental Health Agencies</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Marilyn Underwood, Ph.D., REHS Contra Costa County Environmental Health Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch &amp; Open Forum/Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00</td>
<td><strong>A Community Advocate's Perspective on Navigating the Government Maze</strong></td>
<td>Sherry Padgett, Community Advocate, Bay Area Residents for Responsible Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:15</td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 3:55</td>
<td><strong>Evaluations</strong></td>
<td>Tivo Rojas-Cheatham and Nancy Palate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55 – 4:00</td>
<td><strong>Summary &amp; Closing</strong></td>
<td>Gabriele Windgasse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for this conference was made possible (in part) by the cooperative agreement from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The views expressed in written conference materials or publications or by speakers and moderators do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the California Department of Public Health; nor does mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.
Appendix B: Background and Purpose of Roundtable
Site Assessment Section: What do we do?

- Participation, Outreach, Education
- Investigation of Superfund sites
- Cooperation with ATSDR*
- Response to Community Concerns
- Cooperation with local, state and federal agencies

*ATSDR: Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
Stakeholder Roundtable - Site Assessment Section

Roundtable Goals

- Network
- Share
- Ask
- Understand
- Apply

Resources, Proceedings, Contacts
Healthy Housing and Indoor Air Quality

Rick Kreutzer, M.D.
California Department of Public Health
Basic Human Needs

Food

Water

Shelter
Housing Issue Frames

- Consumer Product
- Public Good
- Basic Right
Healthy Places

Equity

Economy

Environment
According to the U.S. Surgeon General’s “Call to Action to Promote Healthy Homes,” a healthy home is

- sited,
- designed,
- built,
- renovated, and
- maintained

in ways that support the health of residents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Housing Structure Built</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤1949</td>
<td>2,202,686</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1979</td>
<td>6,276,012</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-2004</td>
<td>4,422,721</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2005</td>
<td>533,118</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units per Structure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, detached</td>
<td>7,794,203</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, attached OR 2 units</td>
<td>1,302,995</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>756,255</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>823,752</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>729,288</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>1,493,278</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home, boat, RV, other</td>
<td>534,766</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: ACS 2009
## Occupancy Characteristics of Housing Units in CA, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>12,214,891</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>6,910,054</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>5,304,837</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied units with children</td>
<td>4,566,138</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High quality housing generally implies that the dwelling is clean, dry, ventilated, contaminant-free, pest-free, safe and well-maintained.
Exposure Pathways

Source of toxics → Contaminated media → Exposure route → Exposed person → Health effect

- Air
- Water
- Soil

- Breathing
- Drinking
- Eating
- Touching

- Toxicity of chemical
- Frequency
- Amount
- State of health
- Time in the life cycle
Why is indoor air important?
What causes indoor air contamination?
What are the most common indoor air contaminants?
What health effects do they cause?
Combustion Pollutants
Figure 9

Heating Method for Occupied Housing Units, 2009

- Utility gas: 66.7%
- Electricity: 24.6%
- Bottled gas, fuel oil, or kerosene: 3.6%
- Wood: 1.8%
- Solar energy: 0.1%
- Other fuel: 0.3%
- No fuel used: 2.9%

Data Source: ACS 2009
ED Visits for CO Poisonings in the Home, Age-Adjusted Rates, by Age Group, 2009

Data source: OSHPD 2009

Rates for those under <1 and 85+ years not calculated due to statistical instability.
It can save your life!
Figure 12

Homes where Smoking is Allowed, by Housing Type, CHIS 2009

- House: 6.5%
- Multi-unit building: 9.4%
- Mobile home: 14.5%

Data source: CHIS 2009

"This is slightly lower than the 10% of people reporting no smoking restrictions from CABRFSS (Figure 10), which again, likely results from differences in question wording, questionnaire design and overall survey methods."
ED Visits and Hospitalizations for Secondhand Smoke Illness in the Home, Age-Adjusted Rates, by Age Group, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>ED Visits</th>
<th>Hospitalizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 yr</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 yrs</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17 yrs</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-64 yrs</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-84 yrs</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+ yrs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: OSHPD 2009
Formaldehyde
Radon & VOCs
Lead
Pesticides
### Figure 21

**ED Visits for Accidental Poisonings in the Home, Age-Adjusted Rates, by Cause and Age Group, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Cleaning Product Poisonings</th>
<th>Fuel Product Poisonings</th>
<th>Pesticide Poisonings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 yr</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 yrs</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17 yrs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-64 yrs</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-84 yrs</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data source:** OSHPD 2009

*Rates for 85+ years not calculated due to statistical instability.*
Asthma Triggers
How can we improve our indoor air?
Questions?
Appendix D: Who Could I Ask For Help: Navigating the Government Maze of Environmental Health Agencies
Who Could I Ask For Help?: Navigating The Government Maze Of Environmental Health Agencies

Marilyn C. Underwood, PhD, REHS
Contra Costa County is Part of the San Francisco Bay Region
The Three Branches of Government

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
The Congress
House of Representatives; Senate.
House and Senate can veto each other’s bills.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH
The President
Executive office of the president; executive and cabinet departments; independent government agencies.

JUDICIAL BRANCH
The Courts
Supreme Court; Courts of Appeal; District courts.

Congress approves presidential nominations and controls the budget. It can pass laws over the president’s veto and can impeach the president and remove him or her from office.

The president can veto congressional legislation.

The president nominates judges; Congress can reject judges.

The Court can declare laws unconstitutional.

The Court can declare presidential acts unconstitutional.
Federal Environmental Laws Often Reactionary to Bad Events

- Cuyahoga River burning (1969)
- Drinking water contamination in Minnesota (1972)
- Love Canal (1975)
- Three Mile Accident (1979)
- Clean Water Act
- RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act)
- Superfund
- Low Level Radioactive Waste Act
Major Federal Statutes for Environmental Protection

1. CAA: Clean Air Act
2. SDWA: Safe Drinking Water Act
3. CWA: Clean Water Act
4. RCRA: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
5. CERCLA: Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act
6. SARA: Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
7. TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act
8. FIFRA: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
9. FDCA: Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
10. CZMA: Coastal Zone Management Act
11. ESA: Endangered Species Act
12. NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act
Major California Statutes for Environmental Protection

1. California Clean Air Act
2. Porter-Cologne Act
3. Hazardous Waste Control Law
4. Hazardous Waste Source Reduction and Management Act
5. Toxic Substances Control Act
6. Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (Prop 65)
7. California Coastal Act
8. California Endangered Species Act
9. California Environmental Quality Act
California Environmental Protection Agency

Governor

CalEPA
Office of the Secretary

Air Resources Board (ARB)
Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)
Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Environmental Health Local Level

• 58 counties and 4 cities have a health officer
• Certain state programs may be handled by local jurisdictions
  – Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA)
  – Local Primacy Agency (LPA) for Drinking Water
  – Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) for Solid Waste and Medical Waste
  – Local Delegation Agency for Site Cleanup
Environmental Health Local Level

• Health officer or their designee:
  – Food.
  – Housing and Institutions.
  – Radiological health in local jurisdictions contracting with state health.
  – Milk and dairy products in local jurisdictions with an approved CDFA program.
  – Water oriented recreation.
  – Safety.
  – Vector Control.
  – Waste Management.
  – Water Supply.
  – Air Sanitation.
  – Additional environmentally related services and programs as required by the County Board of Supervisors, City Council, or Health District Board.
  – and may include land development and use.
Environmental Health/Public Health at Local Level

- Most smaller jurisdictions will have an epidemiologist or public health nurse focusing on infectious disease
- Certain larger jurisdictions may have someone or a group focused on the environmental
  - Los Angeles County has the Toxics Epidemiology Program
  - Contra Costa has a Haz Materials Ombudsman and Committee
Air Quality Complaints

• Contact one of the 34 air pollution control districts in the state

• South Coast Air Quality Management District
  – For odors, smoke, dust, and other air quality complaints, call 800-CUT-SMOG
Air Quality Complaints

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District
  - Report Air Pollution 800-HELP-AIR
  - Report Exhaust (Smoking Vehicles) 800-EXHAUST
  - Report Odor 800-334-ODOR
  - Report Woodsmoke 877-4NO-BURN
Contacting USEPA Region IX

- Comments and questions may be submitted to EPA Region 9 staff by completing an online form: http://www.epa.gov/region9/comments.html
- Environmental Information Center can be reached at (866) EPA-WEST
- 24-Hour Environmental Emergencies call (800) 300-2193
ATSDR Petition Process

- Petitioner asks ATSDR in a letter to review information about hazardous substances at a site and evaluate whether exposure to those substances might cause any harm to people.
- ATSDR reviews the petition and decides to accept it or not accept it.
- If accepted, a team either at the state level or federal, investigates and reports back to the petitioner (and the community).
Cal/EPA Online Complaint System

• Use to report an observation of any activity, conduct or physical evidence that you suspect to be illegal or unauthorized or have knowledge of suspected illegal or unauthorized conduct impacting, or threatening to impact, California’s environment or the public health

• Cal/EPA Environmental Complaint Form
http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/CalEPA_Complaint/index.cfm
Local Response to Community Concerns

- Via websites:
  - [http://cchealth.org/contact/](http://cchealth.org/contact/)
- Direct calls to general office number
- Referred calls from other parts of county
- Referred calls from Board of Supervisors staff
- Direct calls to my office
Land Use- a Vital Environmental Concern

- Land Use generally under local control
  - Cities incorporated area
  - Counties unincorporated area
- Zoning and General Plan are primary tools
- State and federal can get involved
  - Coastline/Wetlands
  - Federal or state-owned lands
  - Protection of farm land
Useful Map Tools

- DTSC Envirostor: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/
- USEPA’s Toxic Release Inventory http://www2.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program
- CDPH Environmental Health Tracking Program http://www.ehib.org/page.jsp?page_key=65
- State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/
- CalEPA/OEHHA Enviroscreen http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html
Appendix E: A Community Advocate’s Perspective on Navigating the Government Maze
The RICH get richer, and the POOR...

...get their byproducts.
Richmond Southeast Shoreline Area
On Richmond's 32-mile shoreline
Zeneca Site
Demolition
Derby
2000
Appendix F: Understanding and Approaching Unengaged Communities
UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACHING UNENGAGED COMMUNITIES

HÉCTOR E. ALCALÁ, MPH, CPH
HECTORAPM@UCLA.EDU
OUTLINE

- Defining community
- Factors influencing behaviors
- How organizations interact with communities
- Activity
- Conclusions
WHAT IS A COMMUNITY

• “a group of people living in the same place or having a particular characteristic in common” – Merriam Webster
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

• Allows us to understand why individuals and communities become engaged or not

• Created by Bronfenbrenner (1994)

• Behavior of individual is affected by families, communities and society at large

• Reciprocal relationships
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

- Individual
- Relationships
- Community
- Society
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

- Individual
- Relationships
- Community
- Society
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

- First level
- Refers to everything that exists within the individual:
  - Beliefs
  - Attitudes
  - Perceptions
  - Previous experiences
  - Gender
  - Race
  - Religion
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

- Society
- Community
- Relationships
- Individual
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: RELATIONSHIP LEVEL

- Second level
- Refers to relationships between individuals
  - Romantic partnerships
  - Friends
  - Family
  - Co-workers and colleagues
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

- Individual
- Relationships
- Community
- Society
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: COMMUNITIES

• Third level
• Refers to the community and institutions that exist within it
  • Neighborhoods
  • Schools and other government offices
  • Businesses
  • Workplaces
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: SOCIETY

- Society
- Community
- Relationships
- Individual
ECOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: SOCIETY

- Fourth level
- Refers to laws, norms and systems
  - Economic system
  - Laws and regulations
  - Values
  - Racism, sexism, homophobia etc.
HOW ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGE COMMUNITIES

- We represent organizations that want communities engaged
- We want them to identify problems and/or react to the problems to we have identified
- This normally means we want individuals and communities to “do something”
- There are distinct approaches to attempting to engage communities
HOW ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGE COMMUNITIES: AS EQUAL PARTNERS

- Communities and experts work together to identify problems and solutions

- Organizations can offer suggestions, but ultimately respect the wishes of communities
HOW ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGE COMMUNITIES: AS UNEQUAL PARTNERS

- Organizations identify problems for communities

- Communities can offer suggestions, but ultimately organizations are limited by their missions, authority or expertise
ACTIVITY

• Examine the following scenarios

• Determine the engagement of the community to a specific health problem. Is the community response appropriate?

• How would you intervene/help this community to promote engagement? (If at all)

• What are the potential barriers you could potentially encounter or have to overcome?
SCENARIO 1: VACCINATIONS

- Communities of predominantly wealthy parents are refusing to vaccinate their children.
- There is the widespread fear that vaccinations cause more diseases than they prevent.
- Parents have mobilized and are actively promoting their views.
- The overwhelming majority of the scientific community disagrees with their views.
SCENARIO 2: NUCLEAR REACTORS

• Communities surrounding nuclear reactors are generally ambivalent to their nuclear neighbors.

• Industry experts and politicians promote reactors as an effective means of energy production.

• A few experts see potential dangers to nuclear reactors, but they do not have a wide platform.

• Public programs have limited ability to mitigate risk.
SCENARIO 3: SMOKING BANS IN MULTIUNIT HOUSING (MH)

- Experts have identified smoking in MH as a health risk.
- Organizations have outlined specific pathways for banning this practice.
- Several complexes and homeowners associations have successfully banned the practice.
- Many roadblocks to passing municipality level policies.
CONCLUSIONS

• Communities are unengaged for many reasons.

• We can approach communities in different ways to get them engaged.

• We must balance what the community thinks is important and what we think is important.
Appendix G: Feedback
Stakeholder Roundtable 2014

Feedback Evaluation

- 23 people participated in the roundtable
- 12 of the attendees were community advocates, 7 were CDPH staff, and 4 were representatives of other government agencies
- 11 of the community advocates that participated in the Roundtable completed an evaluation
- 73% of the community advocates that attended the meeting provided written feedback

How effective was the Roundtable at describing healthy housing and indoor air quality?
Total respondents: 91%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How effective was the Roundtable at providing an overview of the environmental health government agencies?
Total respondents: 91%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Ineffective</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How effective was the Roundtable at providing the testimony and the advice of a community advocate navigating the maze of environmental health agencies?
Total respondents: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How effective was the Roundtable at providing an opportunity to dialogue about understanding and approaching unengaged communities?
Total respondents: 91%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Ineffective</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Roundtable 2014

Feedback Evaluation

Did the roundtable provide an opportunity to express your opinions and ideas effectively?
Total respondents: 91%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- “I had an opportunity to share. Presenters were receptive"
- “Healthy housing and indoor air quality"
- “Great respect shown to each individual”
- “A good size (#) for the roundtable”
- “The environment was inviting and a safe place to express ideas and ask questions"
- “Good time for exchange”

Did you gain professional or personal knowledge or other value from your participation in the roundtable today?
Total respondents: 91%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- “I had a chance to hear the experience of others that helped me see hope in the work I’m doing”
- “Yes, especially on superfund”
- “Gained a better understanding of how to navigate the bureaucracy”
- “All the presentations were outstanding. I learned many things that I will take back to my community”
- “The presentation on indoor air quality was interesting and encouraged me to research this topic further and bring it back to my community”
- “Interacting and community”

What do you see as the most important results or outcomes of the roundtable?

- “More informed community advocates”
- “Hector’s presentation”
- “Knowledge of navigation”
- “Networking- talking to community leaders”
- “The relationship building, getting to meet others from community to state and federal organizations”
- “ATSDR’s participation”
- “It inspired me to do deeper research and not be clouded by emotion”
- “Friendly dialogue with stakeholders- stronger relationships and greater trust”
- “Meeting CDPH staff that can help us navigate the public health system”
Please list any additional thoughts you have that were not captured by today's process:

- “Sherry's story was very moving and inspirational"
- “I would have liked more time prioritizing sites where ATSDR can study”
- “Excellent planning”
- “Thank you for providing a forum for a well-told community story by Sherry Padgett”
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