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BACKGROUND

On March 12, 2014, the Site Assessment Section (SAS) in the Environmental Health Investigations Branch (EHIB) of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) hosted a Community Meeting to share information and listen to concerns about two Superfund Sites located within one quarter mile from each other in the City of South Gate in Los Angeles County. SAS implements the cooperative agreement program between CDPH and the federal Agency of Toxic Substances Disease Registry (ATSDR) that assists communities and agencies in addressing health concerns related to Superfund Sites by conducting Public Health Assessments (PHAs). The primary purpose of the PHA process is to analyze potential health risks related to exposures from a specific facility or release. This meeting and other outreach activities were conducted as part of the PHA investigations for the Jervis B. Webb and Southern Avenue Industrial Area Superfund sites in the City of South Gate. Among the comments that SAS received during our outreach activities was the request to include discussions on exposure to non-site related factors. South Gate is one of several densely populated communities close to the I-710 Freeway, where the effects of pollution are disproportionately higher than in other areas of Los Angeles County. In response to the request, SAS proposed to ATSDR to conduct Integrated Public Health Assessments (IPHA) at the South Gate superfund sites, which include all the necessary components of a PHA as well as additional discussions related to potential non-site environmental factors.

In order to evaluate environmental stressors from the perspective of the community, SAS discussed this approach with ATSDR staff and followed up on their suggestion to use the Protocol for Assessing Community Excellence in Environmental Health (PACE-EH). PACE-EH was developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) to engage and empower communities to determine, prioritize, and address the environmental health stressors in their neighborhoods. This community based methodology evaluates and characterizes environmental health conditions; identifies populations at risk of environmental exposure; and prioritizes local actions. The cornerstone of this protocol is the formation of a Community Environmental Health Assessment Team (CEHAT) comprised of residents, community leaders, and representatives from city, county, state and federal government agencies.

SAS informed the South Gate City Council on the PACE-EH protocol in January 2015, and also held the inaugural meeting of the CEHAT on January 12, 2015. Since then, the CEHAT has met monthly and has formed around a stable and productive core membership that has steadily worked through the 13 tasks of the protocol, with SAS providing facilitation and guidance on the PACE-EH process.

A vital measure implemented in the beginning of a successful PACE-EH includes assessing the community’s perceived environmental health concerns. The protocol calls for conducting a formal or informal survey of the community’s concerns (Task 5). PACE-EH requires that the survey consider the community’s character; therefore data-gathering methods are conducted in a manner that will: 1) involve the community, 2) build new relationships, 3) establish a presence for the CEHAT, and 4) educate members of the community. The goals, objectives, and scope of the South Gate assessment were determined by the CEHAT to align with their own vision statement:
“To contribute to make a South Gate that is beautiful, safe, educated, represented, healthy, sustainable, prosperous, clean, and united.”

The CEHAT agreed on a broad scope for the assessment that encompasses human health and the health of the environment, while also ensuring that environmental or social justice issues are addressed. The CEHAT also decided on a combination of formal and informal surveying of their community. In order to represent the entire community and to ensure scientific validity, SAS proposed to use the Community Assessment for Public Health Emergency Response (CASPER) methodology, which is an example of a “Rapid Needs Assessment” for communities. The CEHAT agreed that the SAS assist in using CASPER methodology in the City of South Gate to assess and determine a robust list of environmental health concerns that the South Gate community has, and provide an opportunity to further engage the community to raise awareness of environmental health issues. In order to accomplish these objectives, the CEHAT conducted a CASPER in South Gate on May 27-28, 2015. This report presents the different stages of the CASPER, including planning, conducting and reporting results; and is intended to help communities determine if a CASPER is an appropriate tool to identify their community’s concerns, either as part of a PACE-EH process or independent from it.

CASPER is an important tool developed by the CDC for identifying the community needs in both disaster and non-disaster settings. The use of this methodology can have an important impact on the prioritization of community needs. The CASPER tool allows the South Gate CEHAT to make informed decisions regarding environmental health issues most important to the community as required in the PACE-EH protocol. To our knowledge no other communities have used a CASPER in the implementation of the PACE-EH protocol and it is the first time CASPER was used in Los Angeles County.

METHODS

CASPER Approval

The California Department of Public Health received approval from the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) for the Request for Determination that the CASPER in the City of South Gate is considered “Not Research” and/or exempt from CPHS review and does not require CPHS approval to be conducted. (Appendix A)

CASPER sample selection

Using a modified two-stage methodology from the World Health Organization’s Expanded Program on Immunization, CASPER selects a representative sample of 210 households (7 households from 30 clusters) to be interviewed in a sampling frame (detailed methodology described in the CASPER Toolkit Version 2.0). The “sampling frame” or the area of interest, for the assessment can be a city or county, or any subset thereof. Within a selected assessment area, the sampling frame captures the entire population from which a CASPER sample is drawn and to which the results would be generalized. Within the sampling frame, 30 census blocks (or block groups) are randomly selected. The probability of
selection for the 30 census blocks is proportional to the number of housing units in the cluster block (probability-proportionate-to-size sampling); the higher the number of housing units in a block, the higher the probability that this block would be selected for CASPER. Within each of the 30 census blocks, seven households are selected by interview teams using a systematic random sampling method. Sampled households’ responses are then weighted in order to produce generalizable estimates of the entire area of interest.

**CASPER mapping**

For this needs assessment, the CEHAT chose the boundaries of the City of South Gate as the sampling frame. The sampling frame of South Gate is shown in Figure 1. According to the 2010 Census, the sampling frame, which included all areas within the incorporated City of South Gate, included 24,160 housing units, 807 census blocks, and a population of 94,396. The city boundary shapefile for South Gate was obtained from the Division of Research, Innovation and System Information (DRISI) of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) GIS library. We estimated population and total housing units in the sampling frame and each cluster using the city boundary shapefile as the basis for the sampling frame and Census TIGER/Line 2010 shapefile for block (cluster) geography. South Gate city boundaries were overlaid with TIGER/Line blocks and blocks falling within the city boundary were selected to generate the sampling frame in ArcGIS 10.1. Cluster selection was completed using a custom ArcGIS 10.1 toolbox provided by the CDC.

For the first stage of sampling, we randomly selected 30 clusters (census blocks) within the city of South Gate sampling frame. It is important to note that for the safety of field teams, three separate maps of randomly selected clusters were presented to the South Gate Chief of Police to evaluate the safety of the areas (Appendix B). With the approval of safety from the Police Chief for all three maps, the map with the greatest number of selected clusters closest to the Superfund sites were chosen. In the second stage of sampling, interview teams randomly selected 7 households from each of the selected clusters to conduct household interviews. Within each cluster, interview teams would proceed from a starting point and compass direction randomly pre-selected by SAS (Appendix C). The interviewers were provided with street level maps of the selected clusters that indicate the randomly selected starting point and direction. Interviewers then went to every nth housing unit to systematically select the 7 housing units to interview (n = total number of housing units in the cluster divided by 7; e.g. for a cluster with 35 housing units, teams would survey every 5th housing unit). Teams were instructed to make two attempts at each selected household before replacement (i.e., moving on to another unit). Systematic random sampling was accomplished in all 30 clusters by the interview teams.

Individual apartments, condominiums, and other multi-family housing structures are considered independent housing units; therefore, several households could be selected from the same parcel. Some clusters contained large apartment buildings or backyard housing structures that had either security gates or locked front entrances; most of these households were deemed inaccessible.

**CASPER data collection instrument**

The CEHAT and SAS collaborated to develop a one-page questionnaire (Appendix D) in English and Spanish to fit the unique needs of the South Gate community. Environmental health concerns collected from prior CEHAT (monthly) meetings were used as the foundation for the questions presented in the
survey. Questions were also adapted from the PACE-EH Guidebook\textsuperscript{2} and prior PACE-EH survey tools used in Florida\textsuperscript{7}. The survey tool for South Gate included questions on the following: 1) environmental health concerns; 2) possible solutions; 3) Superfund knowledge; 4) and household age demographics. The survey tool was field-tested during informal surveying throughout South Gate (farmer’s market, street festival), by CEHAT members, and reviewed by CDPH Emergency Preparedness staff with CASPER experience. We learned from field-testing that when people were asked to choose the most important issue from the listed concerns it was very helpful to have a list of those concerns in a separate document for participants to hold and look at during the interview (Appendix U). The survey tool was revised several times to incorporate input.

**CASPER field kit and safety pack**

A field kit with the materials necessary to complete all interviews (described in detail below) was prepared for each of the 15 survey teams. These kits included a materials checklist, pens and pencils, clipboard, an interview training guide, form for tracking and reporting details about each household, the survey tool, consent script and forms, letter of support from the Mayor, and informational handout. Documents provided for field kits were color-coded using colored paper to help make it easier to identify when out in the field (Appendix E). Information on the development of questionnaire and maps is provided in this report in the Methods section under “CASPER data collection instruments” and “CASPER mapping.”

The materials checklist helped field teams account for all supplies and steps in the interview process (Appendix F). A one page interview training guide called “The Art of the Interview” provided teams with a quick reference on how to conduct a successful interview, such as suggestions to memorize introductions and to allow enough time to answer questions (Appendix G).

A CASPER Response Tracking form was filled out by interview teams for each of the assigned clusters (Appendix H). The tracking form collected information on the number of sampled housing units, access to the unit, type of dwelling, if the door was answered, the number of tries, and degree of completion for the interview. These data allows for the calculation of the overall response rates for the CASPER. CASPER Response Tracking forms were modeled from the example provided in the CASPER toolkit.

Referral forms were provided for teams to complete whenever they encountered urgent needs (Appendix I). Any information on referral forms would remain confidential and be forwarded to the appropriate agency for immediate follow up. Confidential referral forms were adopted from the example provided in the CASPER toolkit.

Introductions were first made to households by interview teams based on the consent script. The consent form was then provided to participating households as a copy of what was verbally stated from the consent script. Both the consent script and form were made available in Spanish and English and included brief information on the length of the interview, confidentiality, right to refusal, and contact information for further questions (Appendix J). Field teams were provided with a consent script and consent form modeled from examples provided in the CASPER toolkit.

Three handouts in the field kit were used to provide additional background information to interviewees on the survey. First, the consent form was provided to households as a reference for the introduction and information verbally conveyed in the consent script. Second, an official letter of support from the
Mayor of South Gate was also provided to participating households. This introductory letter informed participating households of their opportunity to help improve South Gate’s health and environment, and briefly explained the roles of CDPH, SAS and the CEHAT for this survey. Contact information for any questions regarding the survey was also provided (Appendix K). Third, a one page informational handout giving more detailed information about the community group behind the survey (CEHAT), survey objectives, the role of CDPH and SAS, and what is a Superfund Site (Appendix L).

_Evaluation forms_ were provided for each field team member to complete after checking back in for the day. The team evaluation was an opportunity for field team members to provide feedback on what went well, what did not go well, preparation work for the CASPER, future participation, and any suggestions for improvements that could be made (Appendix M). CASPER evaluation forms were modeled from examples provided in the CASPER toolkit.

In addition to the field kit, all field teams were provided with a _safety pack_. Items in the pack included facial tissue, band aids, a flashlight, sanitizing wipes, whistles, high visibility safety vests, and rain ponchos. Snacks and water bottles were also provided to the teams. All field teams were instructed to wear safety vests and identification tags at all times when interviewing.

**Field Team Recruiting**

With the help of the CEHAT and other CDPH staff, SAS did extensive outreach in the South Gate community to recruit a total of 38 survey workers (volunteers) to participate in two full days of CASPER activities. The opportunity to volunteer for the CASPER was broadcasted through local colleges and universities, social media networks, personal networks, community events, and by word of mouth (Appendix N). In order to participate, all volunteers were required to complete a short questionnaire and sign a waiver of liability and express assumption form. Information on volunteers’ Spanish speaking ability, access to a personal vehicle, cell phone with ability to text, and walking ability were also asked in the questionnaire (Appendix O). This information was necessary for organizing volunteer duties and assigning field teams best fit for the South Gate community. The waiver of liability form was adopted from the city of South Gate’s event volunteer waiver form for all volunteers to agree to and sign (Appendix P).

There were a total of 15 two-person teams for both days (May 27 and May 28) of field interviews. The remaining 8 volunteers were assigned as alternates and/or help with logistics at headquarters. The interview teams consisted of volunteers recruited by a local faith-based non-profit group (Teen Challenge), community members, San Jose State University School of Public Health, University of California Los Angeles School of Public Health, City of South Gate, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), CDC, and CDPH staff.

**Facilities**

Space for the CASPER headquarters was provided by the city of South Gate Public Works Department. Check-in, training, tracking, meals and logistics were all conducted at the headquarter location.
CASPER training

On May 27, a five-hour just-in-time training session was provided to interview teams by CDPH staff. The afternoon of May 27 and the full day of May 28 were spent with volunteers conducting household interviews in the assigned census blocks, and reporting status to the headquarter team. A one-page agenda with a complete schedule of activities was provided to volunteers (Appendix Q).

Breakfast, sign-in sheet, introduction to the project, and just-in-time training were provided to volunteers on the morning of the first day, May 27. After signing-in, each volunteer received an identification badge to wear. The introduction included a welcome by CDPH staff, background information on the project, message of support by the City Manager of South Gate, and a safety briefing by an Officer from the South Gate Police Department. After breakfast, introductions, and a break, two and a half hours were scheduled for CASPER training. This training provided the overall purpose of the CASPER, instructions on the method for household selection, survey tool, interview techniques, and logistics. The interviewers were trained to complete confidential referral forms whenever they encountered urgent physical or mental health needs. Interviewers were also instructed to refer all media inquiries to the South Gate CEHAT. In addition, interview techniques and skills were communicated with a role playing demonstration (skit) and by reviewing “The Art of Interviews” guide with volunteers. If the teams encountered residents who wanted to volunteer themselves for the survey, but were not part of the selected households, the teams were instructed to provide the link to the informal survey tool on the City of South Gate website. To conclude just-in-time training activities, an hour was set aside for both lunch and interview practice.

CASPER data collection

Volunteers were assigned teams based on their Spanish speaking ability and availability of transportation. From the 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates we know that 42% of households that speak Spanish at home speak English less than very well, therefore all teams were made sure to have at least one partner who was fluent in Spanish (Table 1). Team assignments were adjusted based on volunteer and vehicle availability on the days of the surveys. Teams conducted interviews between 1 pm and 5 pm PDT on May 27; 8:30 am to 5 pm PDT on May 28. Each team attempted to complete 7 interviews in each of the 30 clusters selected with a goal of 210 total interviews, respectively. Two clusters were selected twice (cluster 2 and cluster 19); therefore, 14 interviews were attempted in those clusters. All interview teams were required to check in with headquarters when they arrived and left a cluster. All potential interviewees approached by the teams were given a packet with relevant information in English and Spanish, including a consent form, introductory letter by the Mayor of South Gate, and a handout including information on the South Gate CEHAT, CASPER, CDPH and USEPA agency roles, and Superfund sites.

Team evaluation forms were completed and turned in at the end of the first or second day. After having completed both days of surveying, a certificate of participation was awarded to volunteers who participated for all two days (Appendix R). SAS shared the raw results of the CASPER with the CEHAT on June 15, 2015, prior to this final report.
Data analysis

A weighted cluster analysis of the data collected during the assessment was conducted using the statistical package SAS, version 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc.). The weights are based on the total number of housing units in the sampling frame, the number of clusters selected, and the number of housing units interviewed within each cluster. For each interview question, we reported the projected number and proportion of households with a particular response in the assessment area.

Analysis of unweighted and weighted frequencies (projected number of households), unweighted and weighted percentages, and the 95% confidence intervals of all weighted estimates were calculated using SAS version 9.3. Unless otherwise stated, the estimates reported in the text are weighted, representing the projected response for the entire sampling frame. Corresponding 95% confidence intervals for estimates are omitted in the text for ease of reading and are presented with the full results in the tables.

Results

Response rates

There are three separate response rates that were calculated for this survey: the completion rate, the cooperation rate, and the contact rate (Table 2). The completion rate is the number of completed interviews, with reporting units divided by the goal number of completed interviews. The cooperation rate is the number of completed interviews divided by all eligible housing units that were contacted, where the denominator includes the number of completed interviews. The contact rate is the number of completed interviews divided by the total number of housing units at which contact was attempted, where the denominator includes the number of completed interviews, incomplete interviews, refusals, and non-respondents (i.e., housing units in which no one was home or that was unsafe to approach). Interview teams conducted 199 of a possible 210 interviews, with a completion rate of 94.7% (Table 3). We completed interviews in 77.7% of homes where the door was answered (cooperation rate) and at 45.1% of all approached housing units (contact rate).

Household demographics and home characteristics of the surveyed households and the South Gate community

The CASPER method allows results to be generalizable to the entire city or sampling frame; a total of 24,160 households for the City of South Gate. Of the 199 interviews, 48% or 94 surveys were completed in Spanish; the percent and number of surveys represent 11,685 out of 24,160 households in South Gate. Household sizes ranged from 1 to 10, with a weighted mean of 4.4 (95% CI: 4.0, 4.7) and a weighted median of 3.9 (95% CI: 3.3, 4.5). Household age distribution was as follows: 26% or 51 surveys, representing 6,005 households, had at least one member ≤ 4 years old; 28% or 55 surveys, representing 6,393 households, had at least one member ≥5 - 9 years old; 63% or 126 surveys, representing 15,516 households, had at least one member ≥10 - 24 years old; 88% or 176 surveys, representing 21,418 households, had at least one member ≥25 - 64 years old; 29% or 57 surveys, representing 7,447
households, had at least one member ≥ 65 years old (Table 4). Households lived primarily in single family homes (68%); the remaining 33% lived in a multi-unit complex. English and Spanish were the predominant languages spoken at home, with 48% or 94 surveys, representing 11,685 households, having completed the interview in Spanish and the remaining 52% or 105 surveys, representing 12,475 households, completing the interview in English.

**Overall environmental health concerns**

Households were presented with a list of environmental health issues and asked to indicate any that are of concern. The five issues most frequently indicated as concerns to South Gate households, from greatest to least, were 1) polluted land (75%), 2) public safety (72%), 3) lack of programs to save water (70%), 4) graffiti (68%), and 5) lack of hospital in South Gate (63%) (Table 5)(Figure 2). The five least frequently indicated concerns to South Gate households, from least to greatest, were electromagnetic field exposure (32%), indoor air (35%), noise (42%), and transportation (49%).

**Most important environmental health concern**

From those issues indicated as a concern, households were then asked to select the issue of greatest concern. For the concern most important or greatest to South Gate residents, public safety (24%) was selected most frequently. After public safety, the four concerns selected as most important, from greatest to least, were graffiti (11%), lack of programs to save water (8%), lack of hospital in South Gate (7%), and polluted land (6%) (Table 6)(Figure 3). Households were also asked to provide details on why an issue was chosen as their most important and, if possible, to provide suggestions on how that issue may be addressed (Appendix S).

**Other environmental health concerns**

Households were asked if there were any other environmental health issues of concern that were not asked in the survey. Eighteen percent or 36 surveys, representing 4,425 households, indicated that there were other environmental health issues concerning their household that were not asked in the survey (Table 7). Among those who responded yes, households were asked to provide more information and details on those other issues not asked in the survey (Appendix t).

**Conditional results for most important environmental health concern**

It is important to note that results for conditional frequencies are not generalizable using the CASPER method. This means that the reporting of results given the condition of another does not have the statistical power to be representative of the entire sampling frame. Generalizations for the following results can only be made about the 30 selected clusters within the sampling frame and not for the entire City of South Gate.

Among those households where the interview was completed in Spanish, the top five most frequently selected issue as the most important concern, from greatest to least, were 1) public safety (26%), 2) lack
of hospital in South Gate (11%), 3) polluted land (9%), 4) lack of programs to save water (9%), and 5) graffiti (7%) (Table 8).

Among those households where the interview was completed in English, the top five most frequently selected issue as the most important concern, from greatest to least, were 1) public safety (23%), 2) graffiti (10%), 3) tap water (10%), 4) public lighting (7%), and 5) outdoor air quality (7%) (Table 8).

Among those households who had at least one member ≤ 10 years old, the top five most frequently selected issue as the household’s most important concern, from greatest to least, were 1) public safety (14%), 2) lack of affordable housing choices (8%), 3) tap water (4%), 4) graffiti (3%), and 5) polluted land (3%) (Table 9).

Among those households who at least one member ≥64, the top five most frequently selected issue as a household’s most important concern, from greatest to least, were 1) public safety (13%), 2) tap water (7%), 3) graffiti (6%), 4) outdoor air quality (5%), and 5) lack of programs to save water (5%) (Table 9).

Superfund site awareness of the surveyed households

Households were asked two questions to gauge awareness of the Superfund sites in South Gate. The first question asked if they knew what a Superfund site was, and the second question asked if they were aware of the Superfund sites in South Gate. Most households did not know what a Superfund site was (95% or 188 surveys, representing 22,848 households). Most households were also not aware of the Superfund sites in the city of South Gate (95% or 188 surveys, representing 22,848 households) (Table 7) (Figure 4).

Discussion and Conclusion

PACE-EH and CASPER

This report presents data from the CASPER surveys conducted in the city of South Gate on May 27-28, 2015 to collect environmental health concerns from the perspective of the community. Incorporating the core idea that public health agencies must recognize the community as collaborators, PACE-EH provides methods for local communities to become aware of, carefully consider, and improve their environmental health. The protocol takes the user through a series of tasks to engage the public, collect necessary and relevant information related to community environmental health concerns, rank issues, and set local priorities for action. This CASPER was conducted within the framework of the PACE-EH tasks, and specifically addresses task S in the PACE-EH Guidebook. CASPER was selected by the South Gate CEHAT as the method for formally gathering data to collect information on environmental health concerns from the perspective of the community and to create a manageable list of issues.

Also known as small-community-based surveys, rapid surveys, cluster surveys, or rapid needs assessments; the CASPER method can provide important information that resource intensive surveys
like the US Census do not capture. The CASPER method is based on a cluster sampling approach first promoted by the World Health Organization for gathering data on the community level in developing countries for information such as immunization coverage, diarrheal diseases, respiratory conditions, or smoking behavior. A cluster sampling approach utilizes a two-stage sampling process, with probability-proportionate-to-size (PPS) sampling of 30 clusters at the first stage and a random sampling of 7 households/subjects per cluster. Given limited resources and staff, the two greatest advantages to this method are that they are inexpensive and easily carried out. Although a CASPER has been conducted several times in California, this is the first time the CASPER methodology has been conducted in Los Angeles County and the first time to gather environmental health concerns.

**Response Rates**

The representativeness of the sample to the population of South Gate can be determined by the different response rates. Data used to calculate response rates was collected by field interview teams using the tracking form, therefore it was very important that they were filled out correctly and checked for any mistakes or discrepancies (Appendix H). In comparing the response rate calculations, the South Gate CASPER is now considered one of the most successful conducted in California (Figure 5).

The completion rate of 94.7% for this CASPER shows how close interview teams came to collecting the goal of 210 interviews. This CASPER had the second highest completion rate for all other prior CASPERs completed in California (Figure 5). The high completion rate is a good indicator that there was ample time allotted for teams to complete the minimum number of interviews (80%, 168 completed interviews) in the City of South Gate.

The cooperation rate is a measure of both the eligibility and the willingness of the community to complete the CASPER interview. The lower the number of contacts made, the more the sample becomes one of convenience. This CASPER had the highest cooperation rate of all other prior CASPERs completed in California at 77.7%.

The contact rate helps gauge the representativeness of the sample to the population. Higher contact rates indicate that the field interview teams had to attempt interviews at fewer households in order to obtain the necessary number of interviews. This CASPER had the highest contact rate of all other prior CASPERs completed in California at 45.1%.

**Methodological Differences**

There were a few methodological differences for this CASPER compared to prior CASPERs in California. For the CASPER in South Gate, only a day and a half was designated for field interviews, whereas CASPERs in Lake County, Napa, and Solano County designated at least two and a half days of surveying. The ability to complete the CASPER in just a day and a half was in large part possible due to the much more concise survey tool used for South Gate; which consisted of a single page, whereas the survey tool used in the prior California CASPERs were on average 6 pages-long. The one-page survey tool not only allowed quicker completion of the interview, but also helped foster more participation when households knew that the survey was only one page long.
Having the cluster starting points and direction randomly pre-determined for each selected cluster as opposed to the survey team randomly determining them in the field also helped save time. In addition, the pre-determination of random starting points and direction in each selected cluster allowed more time during the just-in-time training to focus on interviewing techniques and skills.

Lowering the number of attempts at each selected household before replacement from 3 to 2 was another major adjustment that made it possible for this CASPER to be completed in fewer days. This allowed teams to select a replacement home much quicker than having to wait until the third attempt. With the greater likelihood of replacement with fewer attempts, there was concern as to if this would lower contact rates and weaken the representativeness of the sample. However, when comparing the contact rates from the City of South Gate to prior CASPERs, the South Gate CASPER had the highest contact rate (Figure 5). This suggests that lowering the number of attempts may have helped bolster the contact rate by helping find households willing to participate and complete interviews much quicker, therefore strengthening the representativeness of the sample when compared with prior CASPERs.

Another factor that likely contributed to the relatively strong contact rate was the dense residential zones throughout South Gate. For example, some households had secondary housing in backyard buildings, etc. This made going house to house and completing selected clusters much easier and quicker for interview teams.

Given that the City of South Gate is 98% Latino, it was very important that each survey team had one member who could speak Spanish fluently. Teams, therefore, were able to conduct the interview in Spanish or English and not have to wait for an interpreter as with previous CASPERs. This was another adjustment that saved a substantial amount of time.

Volunteer Recruitment

Recruitment of dependable volunteers was very important for the labor-intensive field work. Several local community organizations and networks were contacted for recruitment of volunteers, but the majority of volunteers came from the local non-profit faith-based organization Teen Challenge. Teen Challenge has had a history of volunteer work for the City of South Gate. We recognized that this organization’s extensive experience in going door to door in the community of South Gate in advocacy of their program was a significant contribution for a successful CASPER. They were able to be trained quickly, be comfortable engaging households, and react well when things went wrong during the day-to-day operations of the survey. In order to further communicate the objectives, goals, and positive outcomes in the community from PACE-EH; a short video documentary on a successful PACE-EH in Florida was shown to all volunteers. We recognized that this helped motivate and re-energize volunteers for the second day of interviews.

It is crucial to build rapport and legitimacy when interviewing households. A solid introduction displays confidence and can set the tone for the interview. A consent form, letter of support from the Mayor, and a one page informational handout were all provided to households to supplement the verbal introduction by field teams (Appendices J, K, L). We learned that these three documents were very successful in helping establish both rapport and legitimacy. Households were much more willing to participate after knowing their rights as participants, having support from the Mayor, and provided background information on the project. In addition, these handouts helped contribute to meet the PACE-EH data-gathering objective of providing “the opportunity to engage citizens in learning about the
project, the community, or environmental health; and the opportunity to enhance the visibility of the project and the sponsors.\textsuperscript{2}

CASPER methods instruct that “field interview teams must be prepared to respond if they come across an urgent need that presents an immediate threat to life or health.”\textsuperscript{3} Although the CASPER is not meant to provide direct services to residents, households in urgent need of services can be identified by use of CASPER and referrals made to the appropriate agencies. We learned that field interview teams did encounter a few households that were in need of immediate public health assistance and were able to connect those residents to the appropriate services. We recognized that having this capacity to engage immediate public health needs allowed for the capacity to provide the essential public health system function of linking people to needed personal health services.\textsuperscript{15}

Household age ranges/ demographic comparison validation

The data from this CASPER were validated by comparing results generalizable to the sampling frame to outside data sources that also represent the area of interest, the City of South Gate. We found that demographic results for household age estimates from the South Gate CASPER closely match household age demographic profile data for the city of South Gate from the 2010 Census.\textsuperscript{16} Household age estimates from the South Gate CASPER had differences of only 3\% to 1\% when compared with household age data results from the 2010 Census.\textsuperscript{(Table 4)(Figure 6)} In order to compare language characteristics, we categorized all surveys completed in Spanish as a household with Spanish as the main language spoken at home. We also assumed that having completed the interview in Spanish meant that households spoke English less than “very well.” We found that the South Gate CASPER result for interviews completed in Spanish (48.4\%) closely match results from the Census Bureau’s ACS survey results for Spanish speaking households where English is spoken less than “very well” (42.1\%) (Table 1)(Figure 7).\textsuperscript{17}

Environmental health concerns from the perspective of the community

The CEHAT decided to use a broad definition of environmental health in the assessment of the community. Every issue asked about in the survey was indicated by at least one household as a concern. This helps confirm the relevancy of the issues asked about in the survey to the South Gate community. The distribution of the overall concerns amongst households in South Gate gradually increases; starting from 32\% for electromagnetic field exposure, and up to 75\% for polluted land.

We found that the most important concern indicated most frequently was public safety. Compared to other issues indicated as the most important by households, public safety is at least 2 fold greater than all others. The most important concerns indicated most frequently following after public safety are: graffiti, lack of programs to save water, lack of hospital in South Gate, and polluted land.

Although not generalizable to the entire city, but still informative to the CEHAT, public safety was indicated as the most important concern for all conditional results. Whether households completed the survey in Spanish, knew what a Superfund site was, had young children or elderly living at home; all indicated public safety as their most important concern.
For every issue selected by households as the most important, interviewees were asked to provide responses why that particular issue was the most important and suggestions for a possible solution (Appendix S). These data on why an issue was chosen as a household’s most important concern will help inform the CEHAT when working through the remaining tasks to find and implement an appropriate and effective action plan. For example, for the top most important concern (public safety), most households indicated crime such as burglary, assault, vandalism, homicide, drugs, and gang activity as the reasons for indicating public safety as their most important concern. Suggested solutions for public safety focused on strengthening monitoring/surveillance programs (i.e. neighborhood watch), and increasing police presence and activity. Some public safety concerns were related to traffic; such as heavy traffic, speeding, and lack of traffic lights for cars and/or pedestrians. Suggested solutions provided by households for public safety due to traffic were: more speed bumps, more traffic cameras, stricter traffic fines, more crosswalks, more stop signs, and wider streets.

**Other Environmental health issues**

Most households (80.3%; 19,389) indicated there was no other environmental health issue of concern that was not asked in the survey. This suggests that the issues selected by the CEHAT for the survey were comprehensive and relevant to the community. Amongst the respondents who indicated other concerns, many described issues that were closely related to an issue listed in the survey. It is important to note that many of the environmental issues have overlapping factors (i.e. graffiti and public safety). This should be taken into consideration when selecting and prioritizing issues to address. Some of the other issues provided by households that indicated yes and were not included in the survey were: exposure to radon, homelessness, exposure to lead, improving the middle school, recycling centers, cardboard factory, noise pollution from airplanes, lack of trees, sidewalk maintenance, marijuana/tobacco smoke, abandoned buildings, squirrels and gophers, street parking, and stray dogs (Appendix T).

**Superfund questions**

Per request by USEPA representatives on the CEHAT, two questions on the awareness of Superfund sites were included in the survey. For both questions, 95% of households or 188 surveys, representing 22,848 households, did not know what a Superfund site was nor were they aware of the Superfund sites in South Gate (Figure 4). This was not unexpected by the CEHAT and confirmed the South Gate community’s lack of awareness of the Superfund sites in the city. USEPA was able to use these findings to help justify deeper community outreach activities.

**Team Evaluations**

From the team evaluations, we received feedback on what did and did not go well, and what could be improved. Overall, we learned there was a consensus among volunteers for more training and practice. Suggestions for improvement include having experienced staffs supervise team practices to catch any mistakes, allow for more time to practice interviewing, and more time for practice on selecting homes. However, when asked if volunteers were prepared for their assignment, all volunteers assigned to interview teams indicated yes. We also learned that it would help for volunteers assigned to headquarters to have a checklist of instructions similar to interview teams’ materials checklist to help
make the process of checking people and supplies in easier. All volunteers indicated that if given the opportunity, they would want to participate in a CASPER team in the future.

Recommendations

Based on a preliminary analysis of the data collected during this CASPER, we recommend the following to the CEHAT:

1. Incorporate the results of the survey to inform and guide the selection and prioritization of environmental health issues from the perspective of the community by the CEHAT for PACE-EH.
   a. Results for the top five overall listed concerns.
   b. Results for the top five most important concerns.
   c. Take into consideration responses for other issues not asked in the survey and potential factors that overlap issues already included in the survey.
2. Knowing the list of issues chosen by the CEHAT and lack of Superfund awareness in the community, plan appropriate community outreach and education activities.
   a. Plan education and outreach activities for the community regarding the Superfund sites.
   b. Consider the information from the community on why a particular issue is a concern and on possible solutions when formulating action plans.

The South Gate CASPER was a successful collaboration between SAS, the South Gate CEHAT and many other organizations and agencies; and helped greatly the collaboration between these divergent organizations. The results allow the CEHAT to prioritize environmental health concerns from the perspective of the community. We hope that the results presented here will be useful in addressing and improving the environmental health concerns most important to the community and will be helpful to other communities who consider conducting a CASPER.
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Figure 1. CASPER sampling frame and selected clusters for South Gate, California
Figure 2. Overall environmental health concerns

Note: Error bars represent the upper and lower 95% Confidence Limits for the weighted percent
Figure 3. Most important environmental health concern

Note: Error bars represent the upper and lower 95% Confidence Limits for the weighted percent
Figure 4. Results for the community’s knowledge of Superfund sites

**Does your household know what a Superfund site is?**

- Yes: 5%
- No: 95%

**Is your household aware of the Superfund sites in South Gate?**

- Yes: 5%
- No: 95%
Figure 5: California CASPER Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
<th>Contact Rate</th>
<th>Cooperation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano County</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: South Gate city household age validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>CASPER</th>
<th>2010 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 years</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: South Gate city language spoken at home validation

**South Gate CASPER surveys completed in Spanish vs. ACS Spanish speaker, English less than "very well"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Margin of Error</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent Margin of Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 5 years and over</td>
<td>87,757</td>
<td>+/-560</td>
<td>87,757</td>
<td>(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>8,507</td>
<td>+/-778</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>+/-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>79,250</td>
<td>+/-983</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>+/-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>36,917</td>
<td>+/-1,325</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>+/-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>78,540</td>
<td>+/-942</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>+/-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>36,686</td>
<td>+/-1,308</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>+/-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>+/-90</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>+/-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/-21</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>+/-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander languages</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>+/-245</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>+/-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>+/-109</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>+/-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+/-14</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>+/-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak English less than &quot;very well&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-29</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>+/-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: CASPER Response Rate Formulas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Type</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate</td>
<td>Number of completed interviews / Number of interviews goal (usually 210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation rate</td>
<td>Number of completed interviews / All HUs where contact was made (including completed interviews, incomplete interviews, and refusals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact rate</td>
<td>Number of completed interviews / Number of HUs where contact was attempted (including completed interviews, incomplete interviews, refusals, and non-respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Community Assessment for Public Health Emergency Response (CASPER) Toolkit: Second Edition

Table 3: South Gate CASPER response rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Completion rate</th>
<th>Contact rate</th>
<th>Cooperation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>94.76%</td>
<td>45.12%</td>
<td>77.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of surveys completed in relation to the goal of 210
**Percent of contacted households that were eligible and willing to participate in the survey
***Percent of randomly selected households which completed an interview

Table 4: South Gate Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Characteristic</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Frequency (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=199</td>
<td>n=24,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with at least 1 member in the following age categories&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years old</td>
<td>51 (26)</td>
<td>6005 (4109, 7902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years old</td>
<td>55 (28)</td>
<td>6393 (4399, 8387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24 years old</td>
<td>126 (63)</td>
<td>15516 (13622, 17410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 years old</td>
<td>176 (88)</td>
<td>21418 (20245, 22591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years old</td>
<td>57 (29)</td>
<td>7447 (5432, 9463)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language interviews completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>105 (53)</td>
<td>12475 (9822, 15128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>94 (47)</td>
<td>11685 (9032, 14338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>145 (73)</td>
<td>17104 (14617, 19591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-unit complexes</td>
<td>53 (27)</td>
<td>6941 (4512, 9371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>115 (0, 350)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = number of households
<sup>1</sup>Frequencies do not sum to 199, as households could select more than 1 response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unweighted Rank</th>
<th>Frequency (%) n=199</th>
<th>Frequency (95% CI) n=24,160</th>
<th>Weighted % (95% CI) n=24,160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Polluted land</td>
<td>148 (74.37)</td>
<td>18151 (15997, 20304)</td>
<td>75.13 (66.21, 84.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>141 (70.85)</td>
<td>17288 (15286, 19290)</td>
<td>71.56 (63.27, 79.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of programs to save water</td>
<td>138 (69.35)</td>
<td>16904 (15323, 18486)</td>
<td>69.97 (62.42, 76.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>134 (67.34)</td>
<td>16249 (14267, 18259)</td>
<td>68.09 (59.05, 76.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>129 (64.82)</td>
<td>15198 (13368, 17027)</td>
<td>62.90 (55.33, 70.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public lighting</td>
<td>119 (59.80)</td>
<td>14757 (13070, 16443)</td>
<td>61.08 (54.10, 68.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tap water</td>
<td>117 (58.79)</td>
<td>14454 (12639, 16269)</td>
<td>59.83 (52.31, 67.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LA River</td>
<td>117 (58.79)</td>
<td>13829 (11641, 16016)</td>
<td>57.24 (48.18, 66.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing choices</td>
<td>111 (55.78)</td>
<td>13687 (11058, 15316)</td>
<td>56.65 (46.77, 67.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tweedy Mile Appearance</td>
<td>114 (57.29)</td>
<td>13453 (11195, 15714)</td>
<td>55.68 (46.32, 65.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Expanding community parks</td>
<td>107 (53.77)</td>
<td>13207 (10554, 15861)</td>
<td>54.67 (43.68, 65.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Outdoor air quality</td>
<td>106 (53.27)</td>
<td>12525 (10298, 14752)</td>
<td>51.84 (42.63, 61.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lack of awareness about composting and recycling</td>
<td>103 (51.37)</td>
<td>12935 (10584, 15286)</td>
<td>56.65 (43.81, 69.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lack of community wellness activities</td>
<td>107 (53.77)</td>
<td>12674 (10097, 15252)</td>
<td>52.46 (41.79, 63.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>106 (53.27)</td>
<td>12525 (10298, 14752)</td>
<td>51.84 (42.63, 61.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>95 (47.74)</td>
<td>11846 (9173, 14520)</td>
<td>49.03 (38.0, 60.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>80 (40.20)</td>
<td>10101 (7935, 12267)</td>
<td>41.81 (32.84, 50.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Indoor air quality</td>
<td>72 (36.18)</td>
<td>8471 (6003, 10939)</td>
<td>35.06 (24.85, 45.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Electromagnetic field exposure</td>
<td>65 (32.66)</td>
<td>7674 (5802, 9545)</td>
<td>31.76 (24.02, 39.53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = number of households
Frequencies do not sum to 199, as households could select more than 1 response

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unweighted Rank</th>
<th>Frequency (%) n=199</th>
<th>Frequency (95% CI) n=24,160</th>
<th>Weighted % (95% CI) n=24,160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)</td>
<td>49 (24.62)</td>
<td>5787 (4109, 7380)</td>
<td>23.95 (17.36, 30.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>17 (8.54)</td>
<td>2646 (771.33, 4521)</td>
<td>10.95 (3.19, 18.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of programs to save water (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>16 (8.04)</td>
<td>1860 (913.3975, 2807)</td>
<td>7.70 (3.18, 11.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>15 (7.54)</td>
<td>1726 (724.36, 2717)</td>
<td>7.14 (3.0, 11.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polluted land (for example: illegal dumping, trash on streets, lack of trash cans, and hazardous waste)</td>
<td>12 (6.03)</td>
<td>1438 (366.70, 2509)</td>
<td>5.95 (1.52, 10.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>12 (6.03)</td>
<td>1438 (264.65, 2621)</td>
<td>5.95 (1.10, 10.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public lighting</td>
<td>11 (5.53)</td>
<td>1285 (558.62, 2011)</td>
<td>5.32 (2.31, 8.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)</td>
<td>11 (5.53)</td>
<td>1285 (295.02, 1475)</td>
<td>5.32 (1.0, 9.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)</td>
<td>10 (5.03)</td>
<td>1208 (374.47, 2041)</td>
<td>5.15 (1.55, 8.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)</td>
<td>8 (4.02)</td>
<td>920.38 (249.14, 1592)</td>
<td>3.81 (1.03, 6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)</td>
<td>8 (4.02)</td>
<td>920.38 (249.14, 1592)</td>
<td>3.81 (1.03, 6.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play structures, etc.)</td>
<td>7 (3.52)</td>
<td>824.51 (295.69, 1399)</td>
<td>3.41 (1.06, 5.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>5 (2.51)</td>
<td>594.41 (91.20, 1320)</td>
<td>2.46 (0.5, 4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5 (2.51)</td>
<td>594.41 (0, 1203)</td>
<td>2.46 (0, 4.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)</td>
<td>4 (2.01)</td>
<td>506.21 (0, 1108)</td>
<td>2.10 (0, 4.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)</td>
<td>4 (2.01)</td>
<td>460.19 (0, 1020)</td>
<td>1.90 (0, 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>276.11 (0, 674.28)</td>
<td>1.14 (0, 2.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>276.11 (0, 674.28)</td>
<td>1.14 (0, 2.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)</td>
<td>1 (0.50)</td>
<td>115.05 (0, 350.35)</td>
<td>0.48 (0, 1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of composting and recycling</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0,0)</td>
<td>0 (0, 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = number of households
Table 7: Other environmental concerns and awareness of Superfund sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>Frequency (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=199</td>
<td>n=24,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other environmental health issues not asked in the survey that concern your household?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37 (18.59)</td>
<td>4425 (2818, 6033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>162 (81.41)</td>
<td>19735 (18127, 51342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your household know what a Superfund site is?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (5.43)</td>
<td>1312 (365.45, 2258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188 (94.57)</td>
<td>22848 (21902, 23795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your household aware of the Superfund sites in South Gate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (5.43)</td>
<td>1312 (495.46, 2128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188 (94.57)</td>
<td>22848 (22032, 23665)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = number of households
Table 8: Most important environmental health concerns by language used to complete interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency (%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>199</th>
<th>For interviews completed in SPANISH, environmental Health concerns most important to South Gate households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(27.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(11.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polluted land (for example: illegal dumping, trash on streets, lack of trash cans, and hazardous waste sites)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of programs to save water (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6.38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public lighting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play structures, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of composting and recycling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Conditional results are not generalizable to the entire sampling frame therefore weighted results are not provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency (%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>199</th>
<th>For interviews completed in ENGLISH, environmental Health concerns most important to South Gate households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(21.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(9.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(9.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public lighting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of programs to save water (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Polluted land (for example: illegal dumping, trash on streets, lack of trash cans, and hazardous waste sites)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play structures, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of composting and recycling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Conditional results are not generalizable to the entire sampling frame therefore weighted results are not provided
Table 9: Most important environmental health concerns for households with young children (≤ ten years old) or elderly (≥64 years old)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unweighted Rank</th>
<th>For households with at least one member ≤ 10 years old, environmental Health concerns most important to South Gate households</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)</td>
<td>14 (27.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)</td>
<td>8 (15.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)</td>
<td>4 (7.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>3 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polluted land (for example: illegal dumping, trash on streets, lack of trash cans, and hazardous waste sites)</td>
<td>3 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)</td>
<td>3 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of programs to save water (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>3 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play structures, etc.)</td>
<td>3 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>2 (3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>2 (3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)</td>
<td>2 (3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2 (3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)</td>
<td>1 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)</td>
<td>1 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public lighting</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of composting and recycling</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Conditional results are not generalizable to the entire sampling frame therefore weighted results are not provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unweighted Rank</th>
<th>For households with at least one member ≥64 years old, environmental Health concerns most important to South Gate households</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)</td>
<td>13 (22.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)</td>
<td>7 (12.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>6 (10.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of programs to save water (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>5 (8.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polluted land (for example: illegal dumping, trash on streets, lack of trash cans, and hazardous waste sites)</td>
<td>4 (7.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public lighting</td>
<td>3 (5.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)</td>
<td>3 (5.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)</td>
<td>3 (5.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>3 (5.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play structures, etc.)</td>
<td>3 (5.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)</td>
<td>2 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)</td>
<td>2 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>2 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)</td>
<td>2 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)</td>
<td>2 (3.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)</td>
<td>1 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)</td>
<td>1 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)</td>
<td>1 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lack of awareness of composting and recycling</td>
<td>1 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Conditional results are not generalizable to the entire sampling frame therefore weighted results are not provided
List of Appendices
Appendix A: Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) for the Request for Determination that the CASPER in the City of South Gate is “Not Research” and/or exempt from CPHS review and does not require CPHS approval to be conducted.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
460 R Street, Suite 230
Sacramento, California 95811-6213
(916) 320-3660 FAX (916) 322-2012

05/13/2015

Bartlett, Russell
California Department of Public Health
850 Marina Bay Pkwy
Richmond, California 94706

Project Title: Community Assessment of Preparedness for Emergency Response (CASPER) in the City of South Gate, Los Angeles County, to determine the community’s environmental health concerns
Project Number: 15-05-2002

Dear Bartlett,

The Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) has Approved the above Request for Determination. It is Not Research and/or Exempt from CPHS review and does not require CPHS approval to be conducted. This decision is issued under CPHS Federalwide Assurance #00000081 with the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP).

If the parameters of your project change, or are reasonably expected to change, so that the project may no longer meet the federal requirements for not being research or for being exempt research, you must either:
- Submit another Request for CPHS Determination of Not Research or Exempt Research
- Submit a New project to CPHS for approval.

The Request or New project must describe the changes occurring or expected to occur in your project. If such a Request or New project is submitted, you must not implement any changes until you receive written confirmation from CPHS that your project either does not constitute research, is exempt from CPHS review, or is approved research.

If you have any questions, you may call our office at (916) 326-3660 or email us at cphs-mail@oshpd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lucila Martinez  
CPHS Administrator  
(916) 226-3661  
lucila.martinez@oshrd.ca.gov
Appendix B: Safety evaluation of selected clusters

South Gate CEHAT Survey
Sample selection, Map 1

Date: 04/29/2015
CDPH-DEOIC-SAS
Appendix C: Example of selected cluster map; red star and arrow denotes starting point and direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Number</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster = 1  
HU = 74
### Appendix D: Survey tool in Spanish and English

**Your Health and Your Environment in South Gate: WHAT DO YOU THINK?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (MM/DD/YY):</th>
<th>Cluster Number:</th>
<th>Survey Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>am pm</td>
<td>Team Member Names:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The South Gate Community Environmental Health Assessment Team (CEHAT) would like to identify the needs of the South Gate community. Your input is important because it is the basis for assessing which environmental health issues exist in your community. Please assist us by completing this survey. Thank You!*

#### 1.1 Please indicate with a YES or NO the environmental health issues that concern your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Graffiti</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Polluted land (for example: illegal dumping, trash on streets, lack of trash cans, and hazardous waste sites)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Public lighting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Indoor air quality (mold/alergen, smoke)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Noise</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Lack of awareness about composting and recycling</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lack of programs to save water (for example: replacing lawns)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Lack of hospital in South Gate</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play structures, etc.)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.2 From the issues that you marked YES, which one is the most important to your household?

(write the appropriate letter) __________

#### 1.3 Why?

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

#### 1.4 Can you suggest a solution?

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

#### 2.1 Are there other environmental health issues that concern your household? [ ] Y [ ] N [ ] DK [ ] R

(if NO, DK, R, proceed to 3.3)

#### 2.2 If yes, what are those issues?

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

#### 4.1 Does your household know what a Superfund site is? [ ] Y [ ] N [ ] DK [ ] R

#### 4.2 Is your household aware of the Superfund sites in South Gate? [ ] Y [ ] N [ ] DK [ ] R

#### 5.1 Including yourself, how many people living in your household are in the following age ranges? (list number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Su Salud y el Medio Ambiente de South Gate: ¿QUE OPINA?

1. Por favor indique con un Sí o NO los asuntos de salud ambiental que le preocupen a los miembros de su hogar.

   A. Grasa
   B. La contaminación del agua (por ejemplo, desechos ilegales, basura en las calles, falta de contenedores de basura y sitios de desechos peligrosos)
   C. La apariencia de la ciudad (por ejemplo, fachadas de tiendas no atractivas, falta de árboles, etc.)
   D. Alumbrado público
   E. Seguridad pública (a causa del crimen o el tráfico)
   F. Incendios (por ejemplo, condiciones de vida, presencia de roedores, insectos, etc.)
   G. Falta de opciones de vivienda de bajo costo (en el caso de nuevas casas y apartamentos)
   H. Calidad del aire interior (por ejemplo, contaminación del tráfico o las fábricas, malos olores, etc.)
   I. Calidad del aire exterior (por ejemplo, contaminación del tráfico o las fábricas, malos olores, etc.)
   J. Agua de la llave (por ejemplo, contaminación, mal olor, tabor, color)
   K. Ruido
   L. Transporte (por ejemplo, masas o opciones de transporte, paradas de autobuses, vías peatonales y carriles para ciclistas)
   M. Exposición a campos electromagnéticos (por ejemplo, antenas de torres de telefonía celular y/o de líneas eléctricas)
   N. Río Los Ángeles (por ejemplo, contaminación, seguridad, basura o escombros)
   O. Falta de concienciación sobre el reciclaje y compostaje
   P. Falta de programas para el ahorro de agua (por ejemplo, para reemplazar el césped)
   Q. Falta de hospital en su casa
   R. Falta de actividades de bienestar comunitario (por ejemplo, eventos deportivos)
   S. Aumentar los parques comunitarios (por ejemplo, crear nuevos parques, paseos, estructuras de juegos, etc.)

1.2 De los asuntos que marcó arriba con un Sí, ¿cuál es el más importante para los miembros de su casa? (Escriba la letra correspondiente)

1.3 ¿Por qué?

1.4 ¿Puede sugerir una solución?

2.1 ¿Hay algún otro problema de salud ambiental que les preocupe en su casa? Sí No NS R (Si NO, NS, R, vaya a la pregunta 3.3)

2.2 Si su respuesta es “Sí”, ¿cuál es el problema de salud ambiental que les preocupa?

3.1 ¿Sabien en su casa qué es un sitio Superfund? Sí No NS R

4.2 ¿Están enterados en su casa sobre los sitios Superfund de South Gate? Sí No NS R

5.1 Incluyéndolo (a) usted, ¿cuántas personas viven en su hogar/casa están en los siguientes rangos de edades? (Marque el número)

0-4 años ___ 5-8 años ___ 10-24 años ___ 25-64 años ___ 65+ años ___ DK R
## Appendix E – List of forms for CASPER

### Assembly of South Gate PACE EH CASPER packets

No. of clusters: 30 – City of South Gate  
No. of teams: 15 (2 clusters/team)

To prepare 15 packets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>No. per packet</th>
<th>No. per cluster</th>
<th>No. per packet (for 2 clusters)</th>
<th>Total to be printed (with spare)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Checklist for field interview teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15+5=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Art of interview guide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15+5=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consent script in English (in plastic sheet)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15+5=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consent script in Spanish (in plastic sheet)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15+5=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consent information sheet in English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300+10=310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consent information sheet in Spanish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150+10=160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tracking form (in color paper)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60+15=75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Questionnaire in English (print in color)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300+10=310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Questionnaire in Spanish (print in color)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150+10=160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. City of South Gate Mayor letter (in plastic sheet)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15+5=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Referral form</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60+10=70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Evaluation form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30+10=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cluster maps/ Google earth maps (to be inserted later after deciding cluster assignment)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 different maps</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Google map of directions to cluster (to be inserted later after deciding cluster assignment and headquarters address)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 different maps</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F – Materials checklist

Checklist for field interview teams

***** Remember to check in and check out with a headquarters member *****

Checklist of supplies for field interview teams

1. Identification (badge)
2. Safety kit in a backpack (vest, flashlight, whistle, tissue, alcohol wipe, bandaid, rain poncho)
3. PACE EH CASPER kit (in a file carrier, with all forms)
4. Interview Go Kits (pen/pencil, clip board, letter from Public Health Officer, give-away materials for interviewees)
5. Equipment (first aid kit)
6. Food and water (lunch at HQ at noon)

Field interview process

1. Travel to cluster, text/call headquarters.
2. Canvass the area and count number of houses in cluster.
3. Start on selected house on cluster map and go to every \( n \)th house (total number of houses / 7 = \( n \); e.g. if cluster has 55 houses \( n \) is either 7 or 8).
4. Complete top portion of tracking form.
5. Complete top of the questionnaire, remember to complete the cluster and survey number.
6. Approach the first house and read introduction and consent script.
7. If consent is obtained, conduct the interview. If consent is not obtained or if no one answered, record in tracking form and go to step 12.
8. Remember to read questions exactly as they are written. Be careful not to “put words into respondent’s mouth”. This process must be as standardized across all interview teams as possible.
9. Check through questionnaire to ensure all questions have been completed before leaving the house.
10. Complete a referral form, if needed.
11. Hand out the give-away materials to the interviewee.
12. Complete the last section of the questionnaire to record observational data.
13. After leaving the house, complete the tracking form – remember: the tracking form must be completed for every house you approach, even when no one answered or if household refused participation.
14. Count to the next \( n \)th house and approach (Refer to steps 3-12).
15. Continue until 7 interviews have been completed for each cluster.
16. Text/call headquarters after arriving at a cluster, before leaving a cluster, and/or if there are any questions about sampling.
17. Return to headquarters once 7 interviews have been completed, but no later than 7pm.

Headquarters Address:

City of South Gate Corporate Yard
4244 Santa Ana St.
South Gate, CA 90280
Appendix G – The Art of the Interview

THE ART OF THE INTERVIEW

PREPARE for the interview

• Practice with your partner.
• Build rapport - dress appropriately: be cautious with jewelry, perfume, gum, food/drink, etc.
• Introduce yourself.
• EMPATHY and RESPECT - good eye contact, confidence, convey empathy.
• Remind clients that their responses are confidential and their participation is voluntary. The
terview can be stopped at any time and any question can be refused.

During the interview

• STANDARDIZE: ask the questions in the same order - repeat if necessary.
• Don’t rephrase questions.
• Don’t pre-fill questions: example - the respondent may have answered the question in another
conversation; you should still ask the question and ensure that is their answer.
• Don’t finish sentences!
• Read the entire question.
• Record answers verbatim: i.e., instead of “He said his biggest concern was money.” Write “I
would have to say my biggest concern is money.”

Tips

• Memorize your introduction - this improves rapport.
• If you hear an answer to a question from an earlier statement, use it as a bridging statement to
be able to ask the question in the correct order.
• Use calendar tools.
• Encourage respondents and be confident.
• Determine which team member is the better interviewer - this may change as the day
progresses.
• ALLOW TIME TO ANSWER—PAUSE!
• If the respondent needs clarification, repeat the question first, then elaborate if needed.

Ending the interview:

• LOOK OVER ENTIRE QUESTIONNAIRE BEFORE YOU LEAVE!
• Thank the respondent.
• Leave information and provide referral information where necessary.
• Stop an interview anytime a respondent requests, you feel unsafe, and ask if they want to
continue if emotional stress is evident.
• Look over the questionnaire again when you have left.
### Appendix H: Tracking form

South Gate PACE EH CASPER Tracking Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Cluster # (i.e., 1-30):</th>
<th># of Houses in the Cluster:</th>
<th>Interviewer:</th>
<th>Date of Interview:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) **ACCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampled Housing Units</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House is Accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House is Inaccessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **TYPE OF DWELLING**

| No housing structure |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Mobile Home          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Single Family Home   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Apartment or Condo   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Other                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

3) **ANSWER**

| Door was answered |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Appears as though someone is home but no answer |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Appears vacant     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Nobody home after 1st visit |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 2nd visit          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

4) **INTERVIEW**

| Language Barrier    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Refused to Participate |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Non-resident        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| No adult over 18 yrs old |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Unsafe environment  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Interview begun, not finished |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Interview Completed |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

**Survey # (i.e., 1-7) from Completed Questionnaire:**

**Instructions:** Use one tracking form per cluster. Check where appropriate, but try to choose only one best option for each of the four categories. Go as far down the list as possible for each site you visit. Use neighbors to find information if no resident is available.
Appendix I: Referral forms

South Gate Environmental Health Survey Team

Confidential Referral Form

Date: ___/___/____ Time: ___:

Cluster No.: ______
Interviewer's Initials: ______

Name: __________________________________________

Address: _________________________________________

Contact Information:

Home telephone: ______ - ______ - ______

Cell phone: ______ - ______ - ______

E-mail: ________________________________

______________________________________

Summary of Need:

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

Referral Made: Yes [ ] No [ ]

Referred to: __________________________________
Appendix J: Consent script and form

Consent Script

South Gate Environmental Health Survey

Hello, we are _______________________ and _________________________ with support from the City of South Gate, we are talking to South Gate residents about their environment and health to get a better idea of what are their concerns.

[SURVEYOR: Give print-out of the Mayor’s letter to the participants]

✓ Your house is one of many that have been randomly chosen to be in this survey.

✓ If you agree to participate, we will ask you some general questions about your house, the persons who live there and South Gate’s environmental issues.

✓ The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. We will not ask you any personal questions and we will keep your answers private.

✓ You can refuse to take part in the survey or refuse to answer any of the questions.

✓ Nothing will happen to you or your household if you choose not to take part in the survey.

Please call Haydee Becerra from the City of South Gate at (323) 563-9592 if you have questions about this survey event.

[SURVEYOR: WAIT FOR RESPONDENT TO CLEARLY ANSWER YES OR NO after each question below]

4. Would you like to participate in this survey?  ☑ Yes  □ No

5. Do you live in this home?  ☑ Yes  □ No
   If “NO” Is there someone else who lives in this home that we can speak to?  □ Yes  □ No

6. Are you at least 18 years or older?  ☑ Yes  □ No
   If “NO” Is there someone else who lives in this home 18 years or older that we can speak to?  □ Yes  □ No

[CONDUCT INTERVIEW IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED YES TO ALL THREE QUESTIONS]

[IF NOT, tell them: Thank you very much for your time. Offer the person the InfoSheet on the CEHAT CASPER.]
Ensayo de Consentimiento

Encuesta de Salud Ambiental de South Gate

Hola, somos _______________ y _______________ con apoyo de la Ciudad de South Gate, estamos hablando con los residentes de South Gate sobre su salud y el medio ambiente para tener una mejor idea de cuáles son sus preocupaciones.

[SURVEYOR: Give print-out of the Mayor’s letter to the participants]

✓ Su casa es una de muchas que ha sido seleccionada al azar para esta encuesta.

✓ Si acepta participar, le haremos algunas preguntas generales sobre su hogar, las personas que viven aquí y asuntos sobre la salud ambiental de South Gate.

✓ La encuesta no tomará más de 15 minutos. No le haremos preguntas personales y todas sus respuestas serán confidenciales.

✓ Puede negarse a ser parte de la encuesta o a contestar cualquier pregunta.

✓ No le pasará nada a usted o a los miembros de su hogar si deciden ser parte de la encuesta.

Si tiene cualquier pregunta sobre esta encuesta puede hacerlas en este momento. Si le gustaría confirmar que estamos trabajando junto con la Ciudad de South Gate puede llamar a Haydee Becerra de la Ciudad de South Gate al (323) 578-8619 si tiene preguntas sobre esta encuesta.

[SURVEYOR: WAIT FOR RESPONDENT TO CLEARLY ANSWER YES OR NO after each question below]

1. ¿Le gustaría participar en esta encuesta?  □ Sí  □ No

2. ¿Vive en esta casa?  □ Sí  □ No
   Si respondió “NO” ¿Hay alguien que viva en esta casa con quien podemos hablar? □ Sí □ No

3. ¿Es mayor de 18 años de edad? □ Sí  □ No
   Si respondió “NO” ¿Hay alguien que viva en esta casa mayor de 18 años de edad con quien podemos hablar? □ Sí □ No

[CONDUCT INTERVIEW IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED YES TO ALL THREE QUESTIONS]

[IF NOT, tell them: Thank you very much for your time. Offer the person the InfoSheet on the CEHAT CASPER.]
Consent Form

South Gate Environmental Health Survey

Hello, we are volunteers from the South Gate Community Environmental Health Assessment Team. With support from the City of South Gate, we are talking to South Gate residents about their environment and health to get a better idea of what are their concerns.

✓ Your house is one of many that have been randomly chosen to be in this survey.

✓ If you agree to participate, we will ask you some general questions about your house, the persons who live there and South Gate’s environmental issues.

✓ The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. We will not ask you any personal questions and we will keep your answers private.

✓ You can refuse to take part in the survey or refuse to answer any of the questions.

✓ Nothing will happen to you or your household if you choose not to take part in the survey.

If you have any questions about this survey you can ask anyone here right now. If you would like to confirm that we are working with the City of South Gate you can call Haydee Becerra from the City of South Gate at (323) 578-8619 if you have questions about this survey event.
Formulario de Consentimiento

Encuesta de Salud Ambiental de South Gate

Hola, somos voluntarios del Equipo de Evaluación de la Salud Ambiental de la cuidad de South Gate. Con apoyo de la Ciudad de South Gate, estamos hablando con los residentes de South Gate sobre su salud y el medio ambiente para tener una mejor idea de cuáles son sus preocupaciones.

✓ Su casa es una de muchas que ha sido seleccionada al azar para esta encuesta.

✓ Si acepta participar, le haremos algunas preguntas generales sobre su hogar, las personas que viven aquí y asuntos sobre la salud ambiental de South Gate.

✓ La encuesta no tomará más de 15 minutos. No le haremos preguntas personales y todas sus respuestas serán confidenciales.

✓ Puede negarse a ser parte de la encuesta o a contestar cualquier pregunta.

✓ No le pasará nada a usted o a los miembros de su hogar si deciden ser parte de la encuesta.

Si tiene cualquier pregunta sobre esta encuesta puede hacerlas en este momento. Si le gustaría confirmar que estamos trabajando junto con la Ciudad de South Gate puede llamar a Haydee Becerra de la Ciudad de South Gate al (323) 578-8619 si tiene preguntas sobre esta encuesta.
Appendix K: Letter of support from the Mayor

CITY OF SOUTH GATE LETTERHEAD
Jorge Morales, Mayor

DATE

Dear City of South Gate Resident:

I would like to inform you about the opportunity to help improve our South Gate health and environment. Beginning on May 27, 2015, volunteers in two-person teams will conduct a community survey asking randomly selected households in South Gate what their concerns are about health and the environment in our City.

The California Department of Public Health’s (CDPH) Site Assessment Section (SAS) is helping our city to better understand and address its concerns about health and the environment. A team of community members and stakeholders has been formed and has started working to 1) collect South Gate’s environmental health concerns, 2) prioritize those concerns, and 3) make a plan to address the concerns. This team is called the Community Environmental Health Assessment Team (CEHAT) and they meet monthly in South Gate. If you want to know more about the work of the CEHAT, please visit our website http://www.cityofsouthgate.org/582/PACE-EH.

This community survey will not be used to collect any private information or personal identifying information from you. The volunteers will be wearing brightly colored vests and will have this letter and a name badge, identifying them. Participation in this survey is voluntary, but we hope you will help us and our community by sharing your concerns about health and the environment in South Gate.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Haydee Becerra at the City of South Gate, 323-563-9292 (hbecerra@sogate.org) or Nancy Palate at CDPH, (510) 620-5845 (nancy.palate@cdph.ca.gov).

Thank you for participating in this survey. This information you provide will help the community of South Gate become aware of, carefully consider, and improve their environmental health.

Sincerely,

Jorge Morales
City of South Gate Mayor
FECHA

Estimado Residente de South Gate:

Me gustaría informarle de la oportunidad de ayudar a mejorar la salud y medio ambiente de South Gate. Empezando el 27 de mayo 2015, algunos voluntarios en equipos de dos personas realizarán una encuesta comunitaria donde estarán preguntando a algunos hogares de South Gate seleccionados al azar, cuáles son sus preocupaciones sobre la salud y el medio ambiente de nuestra ciudad.

La Site Assessment Section (SAS en inglés) del Departamento de Salud Pública de California (CDPH en inglés) está ayudando a nuestra ciudad a entender mejor y a abordar estas preocupaciones sobre la salud y el medio ambiente. Se ha formado un equipo de miembros y representantes de nuestra comunidad y han estado trabajando para 1) reunir las preocupaciones sobre el medio ambiente de South Gate, 2) priorizar esas preocupaciones y 3) desarrollar un plan para abordar esas preocupaciones. Este equipo se llama el Equipo de Evaluación de la Salud Ambiental Comunitaria (CEHAT en inglés) y se reúnen mensualmente en South Gate. Si quiere saber más sobre el trabajo del CEHAT por favor visite nuestra página de Internet http://www.cityofsouthgate.org/582/PACE-EH (la información sólo está disponible en inglés).

Esta encuesta comunitaria no se usará para reunir información privada o personal que pueda identificarlo. Los voluntarios vestirán chalecos en colores llamativos y llevarán consigo esta carta y una credencial que los identifica. Su participación en esta encuesta es voluntaria, sin embargo, nos gustaría que ayudara a nuestra comunidad al compartir sus preocupaciones sobre la salud y el medio ambiente de South Gate.

Si tiene cualquier pregunta sobre esta encuesta, por favor contacte a Haydee Becerra en La Ciudad de South Gate, al (323) 563-9292 (hbecerra@sogate.org) o a Nancy Palate en CDPH, al (510) 620-5845 (nancy.palate@cdph.ca.gov).

Gracias por participar en esta encuesta. La información que comparte ayudará a la comunidad de South Gate a estar más consciente, considerar y mejorar su salud ambiental.

Sinceramente,

Jorge Morales
Alcalde de la Ciudad de South Gate
Appendix L: Informational Sheet

Additional Information about South Gate’s Community Environmental Health Concerns Survey

The Community Group behind this Community Survey:

The South Gate Community Environmental Health Assessment Team (CEHAT) wants to know about your environmental health concerns. The CEHAT is a team of volunteers working together to improve the environmental health of South Gate. This team is made of people who live in South Gate as well as county, state, and federal health professionals. The CEHAT is collecting the community’s environmental concerns to find out what issues they should address.

The Community Survey:

From May 27 – 31, 2015, with assistance from the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), the CEHAT will be collecting South Gate resident’s environmental health concerns using a procedure created by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to find out the needs of a community. This procedure of gathering concerns from the community is called the “Community Assessment for Public Health Emergency Response” or CASPER. You can find more information about CASPER on CDC’s webpage here: http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/hsb/disaster/casper.htm.

The Role of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH):

CDPH’s Site Assessment Section (SAS) is providing support, training, and resources for the CEHAT to conduct this community survey. SAS’s main roles are: 1) to find out if a community’s public health was affected in the past, is being affected, or could be affected in the future by a hazardous waste site or release; 2) to find out the concerns people have in communities near hazardous waste sites; and 3) based on the concerns of the community, provide recommendations that will improve environmental health and reduce the community’s exposure to hazardous substances. Currently, SAS is investigating two hazardous waste sites in South Gate: the Southern Avenue Industrial Area Superfund site and the Jervis B. Webb Superfund site.

What is a Superfund Site?

Superfund sites are properties or areas where the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has found hazardous waste that threatens public health and the environment. The USEPA is in charge of studying the contamination at these sites and identifying how to clean them up so that they are not a threat to public health. To learn more about the two sites mentioned above, go to the USEPA webpages: www.epa.gov/region9/SouthernAvenue and www.epa.gov/region9/jerviswebb. For more information about USEPA’s Superfund program, visit: www.epa.gov/superfund.

For further information please contact:

For the City of South Gate: Haydee Becerra: Tel: (323) 563 9592, hbecerra@sogate.org

For the Site Assessment Section: Nancy Palate (Health Educator) Tel: (510) 620 5845, Nancy_Palate@cdph.ca.gov

For USEPA: Heather Parker (Community Involvement Coordinator) Tel: (415) 972-3112 parker.heather@epa.gov
Appendix M: Team Evaluation

South Gate Environmental Health Concerns CASPER May 27 – 31, 2015

Team Evaluation

1. In your opinion, what went well? What did not go well?

2. Did you think you were prepared (e.g. training, food, safety, communications, supplies) for your assignment? □ Y □ N

3. Do you want to participate in a CASPER team in the future? □ Y □ N

4. If we were to do this community assessment and training again, what improvements can be made?

5. Please provide any additional comments

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE TO THE SOUTH GATE COMMUNITY!
Appendix N: Call for volunteers

Call for Volunteers!

South Gate Survey Worker:
Staff from the California Department of Public Health is helping the South Gate Community Environmental Health Assessment Team (CEHAT) to find out the community’s concerns about health and the environment. To do this, we will visit some of the households in South Gate on May 27 and 28, 2015 to conduct a one page survey in English and Spanish. Volunteers must meet the following criteria:

- Be 18 years or older
- Be available on Wednesday May 27 and Thursday 28 2015, from 8:30 am to 6 pm.
- Be bilingual (English and Spanish, verbal and written)
- Be able to drive and have own transportation
- Have a cellphone with text and camera
- Be friendly and professional
- Be able to follow instructions
- Be prepared to walk for several hours during the day

The California Department of Public Health staff will train the survey workers. This well recognized type of survey has been conducted in California and nationwide. A Training Certificate, food, and refreshments will be provided. Please share this information with your community!

If you are interested, please respond by May 15, 2015 to:

Ms. Nancy Palate, Health Educator
Site Assessment Section, California Department of Public Health
Nancy_Palate@cdph.ca.gov
Tel: (510) 620 5845
ANNOUNCEMENT

On May 27th and May 28th, two representatives supported by The City of South Gate and with assistance from The California Department of Public Health will be visiting your neighborhood to ask you to take a survey. The survey will ask what you think about the environment and health in your community. It will only take 10-15 minutes.

The survey responses will be used to make important decisions to address the concerns you provide! Participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential.

For more information please contact:

For the City of South Gate: Haydee Becerra: Tel: (323) 563 9592, hbecerra@sogate.org

For the California Department of Public Health: Nancy Palate (Health Educator) Tel: (510) 620 5845, Nancy_Palate@cdph.ca.gov
Call for Volunteers!

South Gate Survey Worker:

Environmental Health Concerns in South Gate

Staff from the California Department of Public Health is helping the South Gate Community Environmental Health Assessment Team (CEHAT) to find out the community’s concerns about health and the environment. To do this, we will visit some of the households in South Gate on May 27 and 28, 2015 to conduct a one page survey in English and Spanish. Volunteers must meet the following criteria:

- Be 18 years or older
- Be available on Wednesday May 27 and Thursday 28 2015, from 8:30 am to 6 pm.
- Be bilingual (English and Spanish, verbal and written)
- Be able to drive and have own transportation
- Have a cellphone with text and camera
- Be friendly and professional
- Be able to follow instructions
- Be prepared to walk for several hours during the day

The California Department of Public Health staff will train the survey workers. This well recognized type of survey has been conducted in California and nationwide. A Training Certificate, food, and refreshments will be provided. Please share this information with your community!

If you are interested, please respond by May 15, 2015 to:

Ms. Nancy Palate, Health Educator
Site Assessment Section, California Department of Public Health
Nancy.Palate@cdph.ca.gov
Tel: (510) 620 5845
¡Llamado para Voluntarios!

Trabajador de Encuestas de South Gate:
Preocupaciones de Salud Ambiental de South Gate

Personal del Departamento de Salud Pública de California está ayudando al Equipo de Evaluación de Salud Ambiental de South Gate (CEHAT en inglés) a investigar las preocupaciones de la comunidad sobre salud y el medio ambiente. Para hacer esto, estaremos visitando algunos hogares en South Gate el 27 y 28 de mayo del 2015 conduciendo una encuesta de una página tanto en inglés como en español. Los voluntarios deben cumplir con el siguiente criterio:

- Ser mayor de 18 años de edad
- Estar disponible el miércoles 27 de mayo y el jueves 28, 2015 de las 8:30 am a las 6 pm.
- Ser bilingüe (inglés y español. Tanto verbal como por escrito.)
- Poder conducir y tener su propia transportación.
- Tener un teléfono celular con capacidad para enviar mensajes de texto y cámara fotográfica
- Ser amigable y profesional
- Ser capaz de seguir instrucciones
- Estar preparado a caminar por varias horas durante el día

El personal del Departamento de Salud Pública de California entrenará a los trabajadores de encuestas. Este reconocido tipo de encuesta ha sido conducido en California y el resto del país. Se proveerá comida, refrigerios y un certificado de entrenamiento. ¡Por favor comparta esta información con su comunidad!

Si está interesado, por favor responda antes del 15 de mayo del 2015 a:

Nancy Palate, Educadora de Salud
Site Assessment Section, Departamento de Salud Pública de California
Nancy.Palate@cdph.ca.gov
Tel: (510) 620-5845
Appendix O: Volunteer Questionnaire

South Gate Environmental Health Survey Volunteer Form

Name:________________________________________________________

Age:________________________________________________________

Phone Number:_______________________________________________

Email:_______________________________________________________

Are you bilingual Spanish? ________________________________

Please mark your level of fluency in Spanish:

☐ Beginner  ☐ Intermediate  ☐ Fluent

Will you have a vehicle during the days of the survey (May 27 and 28)? ______________________

Do you have a cell phone with capacity to send/receive text messages? ______________________

Are you able to walk/stand comfortably for long periods? ________________________________
Appendix P: Waiver of liability form

CITY OF SOUTH GATE PACE-EH SURVEY EVENT
WAIVER OF LIABILITY AND EXPRESS ASSUMPTION OF RISK

I agree as follows: 1. I am volunteering my services for the City of South Gate PACE-EH Survey Event ("the Event") on a voluntary basis without anticipation of payment of any kind; 2. I will perform assigned tasks that are within my physical capability to the best of my ability, and I will not undertake tasks that are beyond my ability; 3. I am familiar with the safe operation and use of equipment and tools that I may utilize in connection with this volunteer activity, and I will not undertake to use any equipment or tools with which I am unfamiliar or do not know how to operate safely; 4. I acknowledge that I have received and read appropriate instruction regarding this Event, including appropriate safety and emergency procedures, and that I fully understand those instructions and that I agree, after proper inspection, to use only the supplies, tools and equipment provided by the Event organizers; 5. I will perform only those tasks assigned, observe all safety rules, and use care in the performance of my assignments; 6. I specifically acknowledge that I am engaging in this activity as a volunteer, at my own request and risk, and not as a City of South Gate employee, agent, official, officer or representative, and further acknowledge that I am not entitled to any compensation, benefit or insurance coverage from the City of South Gate or any event promoter or sponsor, nor will I make any such claim.

I understand and agree that neither the City of South Gate nor any other organizers or promoters or sponsors or property owners involved in this event, nor any of their respective employees, officers, agents or assigns, (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Released Parties"), may be held liable or responsible in any way for any injury, death or other damages to me or my family, heirs, or assigns that may occur as a result of my participation in this activity, or as a result of product liability or the negligence of any party, including Released Parties, whether passive or active.

I understand that the event involves certain inherent risks, including but not limited to the risks of possible injury, infection or loss of life as a result of over-exertion or environmental conditions. I also understand that the tasks I undertake may necessitate standing in or near streets, alleys, parking lots, or other locations where vehicles are operating creating additional risks to me. Despite these risks, I still choose to proceed in such activity. I know of no physical limitation which should keep me from undertaking the activities associated with this Event. In consideration for being allowed to participate in this activity, I hereby personally assume all risks in connection with the Event for any harm, injury or damage that may befall me as a participant, including all risks connected therewith, whether foreseen or unforeseen. I further save and hold harmless said activity and Released Parties from any claim or lawsuit for personal injury, property damage, or wrongful death, by me, my family, estate, heirs, or assigns, arising out of participation in this activity, including both claims arising during the activity and after I complete the activity.

If I should become injured while participating in the Event, I authorize any physician or surgeon licensed in the State of California to perform emergency or surgical treatment as in his or her sole judgment may be necessary. I further declare that I am eighteen and legally competent to sign this liability release, or that I have acquired the written consent of my parent or guardian. I understand that the terms herein are contractual and not a mere recital, that this instrument is a legally binding, and that I have signed this document of my own free act.

I agree to allow my image to be used in published materials and web sites that promote the programs of City of South Gate Earth Day Event 2015. BY THIS INSTRUMENT I DO HEREBY EXEMPT AND RELEASE ALL "RELEASED PARTIES" AS DEFINED ABOVE, FROM ALL LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY WHATSOEVER FOR PERSONAL INJURY, PROPERTY DAMAGE OR WRONGFUL DEATH, HOWEVER CAUSED, INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OF THE RELEASED PARTIES, WHETHER PASSEIVE OR ACTIVE.

I HAVE FULLY INFORMED MYSELF OF THE CONTENTS OF THIS LIABILITY RELEASE AND ASSUMPTION OF RISK BY READING IT BEFORE I SIGNED IT ON BEHALF OF MYSELF AND MY HEIRS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IF PARTICIPANT IS UNDER 18, THE PARENT(S) (OR GUARDIAN(S), IF ANY) MUST SIGN.

The above participant has my permission to participate in the City of South Gate PACE-EH Survey Event. I have read and agree to the provisions stated above. I know of no health limitations which may restrict this volunteer’s participation in this activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Parent(s) or Legal Guardian(s)</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Parent(s) or Legal Guardian(s)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ESTUDIO DE PACE-EH 2015 DE LA CIUDAD DE SOUTH GATE
RENUNCIA DE RESPONSABILIDAD Y SUJECIÓN EXPRESA DE RIESGO
(POR FAVOR LEA DETENIDAMENTE)

Yo, por la presente, declaro estar informado sobre el peligro inherente del Evento del Estudio PACE-EH 2015 de la Ciudad de South Gate (“Evento”) y reconozco lo siguiente: 1. Estoy ofreciendo mis servicios para el Evento voluntariamente, sin anticipación de pago de ningún tipo. 2. Llevaré a cabo las tareas asignadas de las que soy capaz físicamente de la mejor manera posible, y no aceptaré tareas que no soy capaz de ejecutar. 3. Conozco la operación segura y uso del equipo y herramientas que puede ser que use en conexión con esta actividad voluntaria, y no me comprometeré a usar ningún equipo o herramientas con las que no me he familiarizado o no sé cómo operar de una manera segura. 4. Reconozco que he recibido y leído instrucciones con respecto a este Evento, incluyendo procedimientos apropiados de seguridad y emergencia y que entiendo totalmente las instrucciones y que estoy de acuerdo, después de la inspección apropiada, con usar solamente las provisiones, herramientas y equipos provistos por los organizadores del Evento; 5. Llevaré a cabo solamente las tareas que me han sido asignadas, cumpliré con las reglas de seguridad y tendrá cuidado mientras ejecute mi asignación; 6. Específicamente reconozco que estoy contratado en esta actividad como voluntario, a mi propia petición y riesgo y no como un empleado, agente, delegado, oficial o representante de la Ciudad De South Gate, además reconozco que no tengo derecho a ninguna compensación, beneficio o cobertura de seguro por el Estado de California, el Departamento de Parques y Recreación de California, la Comisión Costera de California, la Ciudad de South Gate, o ningún organizador o patrocinador del Evento y no presentaré dicha demanda.

Entiendo y estoy de acuerdo con que ni el Estado de California, la Ciudad de South Gate, el Departamento de Parques y Recreación, el Departamento de Obras Públicas, o ningún de sus patrocinadores respectivos, empleados, oficiales, agentes o designados (a continuación referidos como “Partidas Liberadas”) pueden ser responsables de ninguna manera por ninguna lesión, muerte o cualquier otro daño que me ocurra a mí o a mi familia, herederos u beneficiarios y que pueda ocurrir como resultado de mi participación en esta actividad, o como resultado de la responsabilidad de un producto o negligencia de las partes, incluyendo las “Partidas Liberadas,” sean pasivas o activas.

Entiendo que ciertos eventos implican ciertos riesgos inherentes, incluyendo pero no limitándose a los riesgos de posible lesión, infección o pérdida de vida como resultado de peligros encontrados, o por esfuerzo extremo o condiciones del medio ambiente. También comprendo que los trabajos que se me asignen podrían requerir el que me pare en calles, callejones, estacionamientos, o lugares donde se estén vehículos en funcionamiento creando un riesgo para mi. A pesar de estos riesgos, aún con mi propia actividad. No sé de ninguna limitación física que me impida ejecutar las actividades asociadas con este Evento. Considerando el hecho de que me permita participar en esta actividad, de aquí en adelante asumo personalmente todos los riesgos en conexión con el Evento por cualquier daño, perjuicio o lesión que me acontezca por participar, incluyendo todos los riesgos conectados con ello, sean previsibles o imprevisibles. Además, no mantengo a esta actividad y las “Partidas Liberadas” sujetas a ninguna demanda o juicio por daños personales, perjuicios a la propiedad, o muerte injusta propia o de mi familia, fines, herederos o beneficiarios que surjan a raíz de mi participación en esta actividad incluyendo ambas demandas que surjan durante la actividad y luego de completar la actividad.

Si resulto lesionado/mientras estoy participando en el Evento, autorizo a cualquier doctor o cirujano licenciado en el estado de California a ejecutar cirugía o tratamiento de emergencia a su juicio si lo consideran necesario. Además declaro que tengo dieciocho años de edad y soy competente legalmente para firmar este descargo de responsabilidad, o que he adquirido consentimiento escrito de mis padres o tutor. Entiendo que las condiciones en la presente son contractuales y no un mero relato, que este instrumento es legalmente obligatorio y que he firmado este documento por voluntad propia.

Yo estoy de acuerdo con que se use mi imagen como parte de materiales de publicidad y paginas de sitios de la Web que promueven los programas del Día de la Tierra 2015 en la Ciudad de South Gate. CON ESTE INSTRUMENTO PRESENTE, EXENTO Y DESCARGO A TODAS LAS “PARTIDAS LIBERADAS” DEFINIDAS ARRIBA, DE CUALQUIER RESPONSABILIDAD POR LESIÓN PERSONAL, PERJUICIO A LA PROPIEDAD O MUERTE INJUSTA, DE CUALQUIER MANERA QUE SEA CAUSADA, INCLUYENDO NEGLIGENCIA DE LAS “PARTIDAS LIBERADAS” SEAN PASIVAS O ACTIVAS.

SÍ ME HA INFORMADO POR COMPLETO DEL CONTENIDO DE ESTE DESCARGO DE RESPONSABILIDAD Y HE ASUMIDO EL RIESGO LEYÉNDOLO ANTES DE FIRMARLO EN NOMBRE PROPIO Y DE MIS HEREDEROS.

Nombre Del Participante  Firma del Participante  Fecha

SI EL PARTICIPANTE ES MENOR DE DIECIOCHO AÑOS, DEBEN FIRMAR LOS PADRES O GUARDIANES LEGALES.

El participante arriba especificado tiene mi permiso para participar en el Evento del Estudio PACE_EH 2015 DE LA CIUDAD DE SOUTH GATE. Un leído y estoy de acuerdo con las medidas arriba previstas. No sé de ninguna limitación de salud que pueda restringir la participación de éste en esta actividad.

Firma de Padre(s) o tutor(s) legal

Dirección

Firma de Padre(s) o tutor(s) legal

Teléfono
Appendix Q: Just-in-time training agenda

South Gate, CA – CASPER May 27-28, 2015
Schedule for interview teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1 – May 27, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30</td>
<td>Breakfast, Team check-in, and badges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>Welcome address and introductions</td>
<td>Nancy Palate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Background</td>
<td>Dr. Gabriele Windgasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words from City of South Gate Representative</td>
<td>Mike Flad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Briefing</td>
<td>South Gate Police Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASPER Overview and hand out packets</td>
<td>Jason Wilken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review CASPER packets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:10</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 10:55</td>
<td>House selection/ Form completion (CASPER teams)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55 – 11:25</td>
<td>Questionnaires and interview tips (CASPER teams)</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25 – 11:30</td>
<td>Skit</td>
<td>Jason Wilken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 11:45</td>
<td>The Art of Interviews</td>
<td>Kathleen Attfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 12:45</td>
<td>WORKING LUNCH – Practice interviews</td>
<td>Alcira Dominguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 – 1:00</td>
<td>Wrap up, logistics and questions</td>
<td>Jason Wilken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:15</td>
<td>Check-out equipment and go-kits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 5:00</td>
<td>Conduct field interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 – 6:00</td>
<td>Check-in teams &amp; evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 7:00</td>
<td>Debriefing (review progress, discuss experience and lessons learned,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refill packets for next day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 2 – May 28, 2015

| Time           | Activities                                                                 |                                |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|                                |
| 8:00 – 8:30    | Breakfast, team check-in and badges                                        |                                |
| 8:30 – 5:00    | Conduct field interviews                                                   |                                |
| 12:00 – 1:00   | Lunch                                                                      |                                |
| 5:00 – 6:00    | Check-in teams, equipment and go-kits, evaluations                          |                                |
| 6:00 – 7:00    | Debriefing (review progress, discuss experience and lessons learned,       |                                |
|                | refill packets for next day)                                                |                                |
Appendix R: Certificate of Participation

Certificate of Participation

Awarded to:

For successful participation in the training for the “Community Assessment for Public Health Emergency Response” (CASPER) and in the South Gate Environmental Health Survey on May 27 and 28, 2015

Gabriele Windgasse
Site Assessment Section, Chief
Environmental Health Investigations Branch
California Department of Public Health

May 28, 2015
Appendix S: Responses for why an issue was selected as the household’s most important concern and possible solutions

E. Public Safety

![Public Safety: Why it is an issue chart]

- General crime: 23%
- Gang-related: 18%
- Traffic - density: 16%
- Violent crime: 16%
- Theft: 14%
- Traffic - speeding: 9%
- Traffic - school: 5%
- Vandalism: 2%

![Public Safety: Possible solutions chart]

- More police patrols: 47%
- More traffic signals: 19%
- Community...: 13%
- More public lighting: 6%
- Family activities: 6%
- Wider streets: 2%
- No loitering signs: 2%
- More housing: 2%
- Gang prevention: 2%
A. Graffiti

**Graffiti: Why it is an issue**

- Urban blight: 71%
- Gang graffiti: 29%

**Graffiti: Possible Solutions**

- Faster graffiti removal: 46%
- More police patrols: 23%
- Community reporting: 15%
- Involve guardians of offenders: 8%
- Youth graffiti prevention: 8%
P. Lack of programs to save water

**Lack of Programs to Save Water: Why it is an issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA drought</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Water</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lack of Programs to Save Water: Possible solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote public water saving programs</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce water usage</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought-resistant plants</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. Lack of hospital in South Gate

Lack of Hospital in South Gate: Why it is an issue

No local hospital 100%

Lack of Hospital in South Gate: Possible solutions

Build a hospital in South Gate 93%

Notify city of gaps in healthcare 7%
D. Public lighting

**Public Lighting: Why it is an issue**

- Dark streets: 60%
- Long wait to repair street lights: 40%

**Public Lighting: Possible solutions**

- More street lighting on dark streets: 64%
- Faster response for broken lights: 36%
Tap Water: Why it is an issue

- Smell of water: 45%
- Taste of water: 18%
- Color of water: 18%
- General water quality: 18%

Tap Water: Possible solutions

- Filter tap water: 63%
- Maintain water pipes: 25%
- Purchase filtered water: 13%
F. Sanitation

### Sanitation: Why it is an issue

- **Pest infestations**: 90%
- **Urban blight**: 10%

### Sanitation: Possible solutions

- **Increase/improve vector control services**: 56%
- **More police enforcement for sanitation**: 11%
- **Improve affordable housing conditions**: 11%
- **Ensure sewers and alley ways are free of trash**: 11%
- **Improve community awareness of vector control services**: 11%
C. Tweedy Mile appearance

**Tweedy Mile Appearance: Why it is an issue**

- Unattractive store fronts: 88%
- Graffiti: 13%

**Tweedy Mile Appearance: Possible solutions**

- Support new businesses: 29%
- Improve code enforcement for businesses: 29%
- Improve storefront landscaping: 29%
- Prevent gang graffiti on stores: 14%
G. Lack of affordable housing choices

Lack of Affordable Housing Choices: Why it is an issues

- High cost of living: 88%
- Homelessness: 13%

Lack of Affordable Housing Choices: Possible solutions

- Increase minimum wage: 33%
- Living cost support: 17%
- More senior housing: 17%
- Involve faith community: 17%
- Affordable housing near Atlantic and Tweedy: 17%
S. Expanding community parks

Expanding community parks: Why it is an issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need more parks for community</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need more parks for youth</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more parks for elderly</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expanding community parks: Possible solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide family education/services at parks</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve current park infrastructure</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness of activities/programs at parks</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More activities for elderly at parks</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build more parks for youth</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K. Noise

Noise: Why it is an issue

- Traffic Noise: 80%
- Cannot sleep: 20%

Noise: Possible solutions

- Improve city enforcement of noise nuisances: 50%
- Reduce street traffic: 25%
- Better control of school traffic: 25%
L. Transportation

Transportation: Why it is an issue

- Streets, sidewalks, and lights in disrepair: 50%
- More frequent stops for public transportation: 25%
- Not enough public transportation for elderly: 25%

Transportation: Possible solutions

- Improve maintenance of walking paths and streets: 50%
- Increase number of stops for public transportation: 25%
- Faster response to repair streets: 25%
R. Lack of community wellness activities

### Lack of community wellness activities: Why it is an issue

- **Lack of wellness activities/programs**: 75%
- **High fees for wellness activities**: 25%

### Lack of community wellness activities: Possible solutions

- **Increase centers/space for wellness activities**: 100%
I. Indoor air quality

Indoor air quality: Why it is an issue

- Indoor mold: 50%
- Indoor tobacco smoke: 50%

Indoor air quality: Possible solutions

- Repair indoor water leaks: 100%
N. Los Angeles River

**LA River: Why it is an issue**

- Potential city asset: 50%
- River is unclean and unsafe: 50%

**LA River: Possible solutions**

- Use transportation funds to improve usability: 50%
- Improve clean up of river: 50%
M. Electromagnetic field exposure

**Electromagnetic Field Exposure: Why it is an issue**

- Major power lines through neighborhoods
  - 100%

**Electromagnetic Field Exposure: Possible solutions**

- Relocate major power lines away from residential areas
  - 100%

O. Lack of awareness about composting and recycling

*No responses provided for “Lack of awareness about composting and recycling”*
Appendix T: Other Environmental Issues not asked in the survey

Commercial traffic and noise
Lack of residential street parking
Lack of disabled parking
Lack of streets into and out of city
Commercial vehicles parking in neighborhoods
Airplane noise
Dilapidated housing
Abandoned buildings
Stray animal/pets waste
Underperforming schools
Smoking in public spaces
Lack of drought friendly programs and education
Lead exposure in homes
Radon exposure in homes
Pollution from nearby industrial operations
Pollution from recycling centers near homes
Pollution from cardboard factory on Otis and Independence
Cross-town pollution
Dust from fabric factory
Littering/dumping at parks and public spaces
Lack of trash receptacles @ public spaces and parks
Lack of trees
Squirrels and gophers
Appendix U: South Gate Environmental Health Survey List of Concerns

South Gate Environmental Health Survey List of Concerns

A------Graffiti

B------Polluted land

C------Tweedy Mile appearance (for example: unattractive storefronts, lack of trees, etc.)

D------Public lighting

E------Public Safety (due to crime or traffic)

F------Sanitation (for example: living conditions, presence of rodents, insects, etc.)

G------Lack of affordable housing choices (for example: no new houses and apartments)

H------Outdoor air quality (for example: traffic and/or industry pollution, bad smells, etc.)

I------Indoor air quality (molds/allergens, smoke)

J------Tap water (for example: contamination, bad color, flavor or smell)

K------Noise

L------Transportation (for example: more transit options, bus stops, walkways, and bike paths)

M------Electromagnetic field exposure (for example: from cell phone towers and/or power lines)

N------L.A. River (for example: pollution, safety, trash or debris)

O------Lack of awareness about composting and recycling

P------Lack of programs to save water (for example: replacing lawns)

Q------Lack of hospital in South Gate

R------Lack of community wellness activities (for example: fitness and sporting events)

S------Expanding community parks (for example: by adding new parks, pavilions, play-structures, etc.)
A----Grafiti
B----La contaminación del suelo (por ejemplo: desechos ilegales, basura en las calles, falta de contenedores de basura y sitios de desechos peligrosos)
C----La apariencia de Tweedy Mile (por ejemplo: fachadas de tiendas no atractivas, falta de árboles)
D-----Alumbrado público
E-----Seguridad Pública (a causa del crimen o el tráfico)
F-----Higiene (por ejemplo: condiciones de vida, presencia de roedores, insectos, etc.)
G-----Falta de opciones de vivienda de bajo costo (por ejemplo de nuevas casas y apartamentos)
H-----Calidad del aire exterior (por ejemplo por la contaminación del tráfico o las fábricas, malos olores)
I------Calidad del aire interior (por ejemplo por moho, humo)
J------Agua de la llave (por ejemplo: contaminación, mal olor, sabor o color)
K-----Ruido
L------Transporte (por ejemplo más opciones de transportación, paradas de autobuses, vías peatonales y carriles para ciclistas)
M------Exposición a campos electromagnéticos (por ejemplo antenas de torres de telefonía celular y/o de líneas eléctricas)
N------Río Los Angeles (por ejemplo la contaminación, seguridad, basura o escombros)
O------Falta de concientización sobre el reciclaje y compostaje
P------Falta de programas para el ahorro de agua (por ejemplo para reemplazar el césped)
Q------Falta de hospital en South Gate
R------Falta de actividades de bienestar comunitario (por ejemplo eventos deportivos)
S-------Aumentar los parques comunitarios (por ejemplo crear nuevos parques, pabellones, estructuras de juegos, etc.)
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