**DAY 1 OBJECTIVES:**

- Understand the value and purpose of HIA and review examples of a past HIA projects
- Understand the collaborative nature of HIA and roles for diverse stakeholders in the HIA process
- Learn about the Hawaii County Agricultural Development Plan HIA
- Achieve consensus around goals for the HIA
- Learn about the Screening step of HIA and discuss the screening criteria for the HIA
- Learn about the Scoping step of HIA and discuss preliminary scoping categories for the HIA
- Work in small groups to scope out the HIA in greater detail
- Learn about the Assessment step of HIA and discuss approaches to qualitative and quantitative data collection
- Work in small groups to identify data sources and resources for the Hawaii County Agricultural Development Plan HIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Coffee and Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Making the Connection between Agricultural Policy, Land Use and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Introduction to Health Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>HIA Examples and Roles for Stakeholders (con’t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Overview of the Hawaii County Agricultural Development Plan HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>Establishing Goals for the HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>Review and Discuss HIA Screening and Screening Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Introduction to HIA Scoping and Proposed Scope for Hi Ag. Development Plan HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>Introduction to HIA Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>Wrap-up, Review Day 2 Agenda, and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION TO HIA

Objective

Ensure that health and health disparities are considered in decision-making using an objective and scientific approach, and engage stakeholders in the process.

Essential Tasks

- **Screening**: Determines the need and value of a HIA
- **Scoping**: Determines which health impacts to evaluate, analysis methods, and a workplan
- **Assessment**: Provides 1) a profile of existing health conditions; 2) evaluation of potential health impacts; 3) strategies to manage identified adverse health impacts
- **Reporting**: Includes the development of the HIA report and communication of findings and recommendations
- **Monitoring**: Tracks impacts on decision-making processes and the decision as well as impacts of the decision on health determinants

Key Points

- **Health Impact Assessment**: is a combination of procedures, methods and tools that systematically judges the potential, and sometimes unintended, effects of a policy, plan, or project on the health of a population and the distribution of those effects within the population. HIA identifies appropriate actions to manage those effects.

- **HIA is used to assess a defined project, plan, or policy**: The purpose of HIA is to inform decision-makers before they make a decision. A HIA is most often carried out before a decision is made or a proposal is implemented.

- **HIA address social determinants of health**: HIA assesses how proposed projects, plans, and policies affect issues – such as housing, employment, transportation, access to public and retail services, social cohesion, education, and incarceration – and how those impacts affect health outcomes and health inequities.

Using a health frame can be persuasive. Health is a value we all share. We experience health personally and collectively. Health is one of the few indicators of quality of life and well-being. Disparities in health outcomes can lead to moral outrage.

The purposes of HIA analysis and reporting are to:

- Judge the health effects of the proposed project, plan or policy
- Make health impacts more explicit
- Highlight health disparities
- Provide recommendations to improve the decision
- Shape public decisions and discourse

The purposes of the HIA process are to:

- Engage and empower communities
- Emphasize everyday experiences in decision-making
- Build consensus around decisions
- Build relationships and collaborations
Key Points (cont’d)

HIA has many benefits. It:
• Provides a comprehensive lens on issues and helps identify trade-offs in decision-making.
• Supports community engagement and legitimizes “unheard” voices.
• Helps to provide input up-front in decision-making and build support for better outcomes.
• Considers historical, cumulative and disparate impacts.
• Targets communities experiencing the most significant policy externalities.

HIAs have been conducted on:
• Land use and transportation plans and projects, including:
  • Comprehensive, general, and area plans
  • Mixed-use and residential development projects
  • Transit-oriented development
  • Port and freeway expansions
• Employment policies
• Natural resource extraction projects

Resources

A Health Impact Assessment Toolkit: A Handbook to Conducting HIA, 2nd Edition. Developed by HIP, this toolkit introduces and defines HIA, describes each step of the HIA process, and discusses other aspects of HIA such as collaboration and when to use HIA. The toolkit also contains practice exercises for the reader.
http://humanimpact.org/HIA_Toolkit_0410.pdf

Practice Standards for Health Impact Assessment. Created by the North American HIA Practice Standards Working Group, these standards were developed to provide practitioners of health impact assessment with a set of benchmarks to guide their own HIA practice, and to stimulate discussion about HIA content and quality in this emerging field.
http://www.sfphes.org/HIA_Practice_Standards.htm

Human Impact Partners HIA training materials
http://www.humanimpact.org/Tools.html

HIA Case Studies

Jack London Gateway Rapid HIA
http://www.humanimpact.org/JLG_case_study_draft.pdf

Humboldt County General Plan HIA
http://www.humanimpact.org/HumboldtGPUHIA_CaseStudy.pdf

Other Websites

San Francisco Department of Public Health
www.sfphes.org

Health Impact Project (Pew & RWJF)
www.healthimpactproject.org

UCLA HIA Clearinghouse
www.ph.ucla.edu/hs/hiaclic

World Health Organization
http://www.who.int/hia/en/

University of New South Wales
http://www.hiaconnect.edu.au/
Health Impact Assessment Training

Introductions

Name

Agency/organization & focus of your work

Experience with and interest in HIA

Human Impact Partners - Goals

Equity and justice

Democracy and transparency

Elevation of community voices

Sustainability

Improving health

Reducing health disparities

The “Subway” to Our Vision
Promote and support the use of HIA in public decision-making:
- By funding successful HIAs, build a case for the value and range of applications of HIA
  - Call for Proposals – 200 applications in 43 states
- HIAs of federal legislation or administrative decisions
- Supporting HIA institutionalization in government – legislation, building agency capacity, policy briefs.
- A website with resources, training materials, case studies, policy briefs – www.healthimpactproject.org
- Collaborating with organizations with established expertise, and supporting agencies and organizations new to HIA

Health Impact Project
Funded (or pending) Projects

6. Medical-Legal Partnerships for Health: with Illinois Citizens Utility Board, they will evaluate proposed automatic power metering in Chicago.

7. Green River KY Health Dept: with the state health dept, they will do an HIA of 3 proposed coal gasification plants

8. Upstream Public Health: a non-profit public health org will do an HIA of proposed Farm to School legislation in OR, with the OR Dept. of Ag. (final funding decision pending)

9. Texas State University: Houston’s Urban Corridor Planning project. The city initiative calls for transit-oriented development where light-rail is planned.

10. ISSIAH: A faith-based organization will conduct an HIA of proposed land-use changes related to a new light-rail transit line that will connect the Twin Cities.

---

**Health Impact Project: Funded Projects**

1. **CA DPH**: The state health department is doing an HIA to inform CARB’s carbon cap and trade regulation
2. **New Hampshire Center for Public Policy**: HIA of the 2011 state budget process
3. **UCLA**:
   - Proposed subway line
   - Municipal/regional water conservation laws
4. **Georgia Tech**:
   - Large industrial park on a brownfield
   - Metropolitan transportation plan
5. **Kohala Center**: An agricultural plan that will look at the effects of proposals to increase the local food and bioenergy supply in an island setting
6. **MA DPH**: the state health dept will collaborate with the DEQ on an HIA of a controversial power plant proposal, and through this HIA develop an institutional framework for all major permitting

---

**Agenda: Day 1**

- **8:30** Coffee and registration
- **9:00** Welcome & introductions
- **9:30** Making the connection between agricultural policy, land use and health
- **9:45** Introduction to Health Impact Assessment
- **10:30** Break
- **10:40** HIA Examples and Roles for Stakeholders
- **11:00** Overview of the Hawaii County Agricultural Development Plan HIA
- **11:20** Establish Goals for the HIA
- **11:40** Review and Discuss HIA Screening
- **12:30** Lunch
- **1:30** Introduction to HIA Scoping and Proposed Scope for the HI Ag. Development Plan HIA
- **2:30** Break
- **2:40** Introduction to HIA assessment
- **3:45** Wrap-up, review day 2 agenda, evaluation
- **4:15** Adjourn
Factors Responsible for Population Health

Introduction to Health Impact Assessment

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

Incorporating Health into Decision-Making

Why Health?

The world would look different

Development

Farm Policy

Incarceration

Immigration

Ports

Education

Limitations to economics-based decision-making

Externalities

Disparities

Money is not the same as happiness

A health frame can be persuasive

People understand health personally

Health is an indicator of quality of life and well-being

Health is a shared value

People are morally outraged by health inequities
**HIA Definition**

Health Impact Assessment

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

International Association for Impact Assessment, 2006

**HIA Addresses Determinants of Health**

How does the proposed project, plan, policy affect

- Democratic process
- Housing
- Air quality
- Noise
- Safety
- Social networks
- Nutrition
- Parks and natural space
- Private goods and services
- Public services
- Transportation
- Social equity
- Livelihood
- Water quality
- Education

...and lead to health outcomes

**HIA Purpose**

Primary

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

Secondary

- Engage & empower community
- Emphasize everyday experience
- Build consensus
- Build relationships & collaborations

**A Brief History of HIA**

1969 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires study of environmental & health effects (however, health impacts have not been adequately addressed in EIA)

1980s WHO encourages Health Promotion/Healthy Public Policy in 1986 Ottawa Charter

1990s England, Acheson Report recommends analysis of impacts of policy on health inequities

WHO publishes Gothenburg Consensus Paper on HIA

First HIA in US (SFDPH, Living Wage)

2000s World Bank requires HIA of all large projects

HIA on proposed Alaska North Slope Oil Lease (first integrated HIA into federal EIA)

2010s HIA used around the world and, recently, across the U.S.

North American HIA Practice Standards Released

HIA continues to gain momentum
Steps of a HIA

**Screening**
Determines the need and value of a HIA

**Scoping**
Determines which health impacts to evaluate, methods for analysis, and a workplan

**Assessment & Recommendations**
Provides:
1) a profile of existing health conditions
2) evaluation of potential health impacts
3) strategies to manage identified adverse health impacts

**Reporting**
Includes:
1) development of the HIA report
2) communication of findings & recommendations

**Monitoring**
Tracks:
1) impacts on decision-making processes and the decision
2) impacts of the decision on health determinants

HIA can evaluate many types of projects, plans, policies

- **Land use plans**
  - Housing developments, revitalization plans

- **Transportation plans**
  - New transit stations, roadway expansions, new rail lines

- **Comprehensive or specific area plans**
  - Guides for future development

- **City, state, or national policies**
  - Labor, education, incarceration, immigration

The following are examples of completed HIA projects

HIP HIA Projects

- Comprehensive / Specific / Transit-Oriented Development Plans
  - Humboldt County General Plan Update
  - Mountain View General Plan Update
  - Oakland Estuary Specific Plan
  - San Pablo Avenue corridor
  - Pittsburg Avenue Railroad Specific Plan
  - Concord Naval Weapons Station Reuse Plan

- Housing Projects
  - East Palo Alto redevelopment
  - Jack London Gateway development
  - Los Angeles redevelopment
  - San Francisco public housing redevelopment

- State / Local Policies
  - I-710 expansion in California
  - Vehicle miles traveled legislation in Oregon
  - Paid sick days legislation in California, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire

Project Example 1

A Health Impact Assessment of the Humboldt County General Plan Update
Humboldt Background

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

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

Proposed Alternatives

Alternative A
“Focused growth”
All new units built in areas with existing infrastructure
6,000 units over 25 years

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

Alternative C
Requires expansion of infrastructure
Allows new housing in outlying areas
18,000 units (6,000 urban/12,000 non-urban)

Humboldt Screening

Clearly defined decision to be made
Decision will impact health
Public health involvement invited
Resources available
Variety of stakeholders interested

Humboldt Scoping

Process
Led by Public Health, HumPAL, and HIP
Conducted three focus groups with ~50 participants

35 community health indicators used to assess 3 alternatives
Healthy housing
Safe and sustainable transportation
Environmental stewardship
Public infrastructure
Public safety/Social cohesion
Healthy economy
Humboldt Assessment

For each of the 35 indicators
- Literature review
- Collection of existing conditions data
- Analysis of how 3 alternatives would impact indicators, including vulnerable populations
- GIS mapping
- Potential mitigations

Data Contributors

Humboldt County Public Works
Humboldt County Community Development Services
California Department of Forestry
Humboldt State University
UC Davis Agricultural Extension Service
First Five Commission
Area 1 Agency on Aging
Jacoby Creek Land Trust
Childcare Planning Council
North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District
North Coast Emergency Medical Services
Humboldt Partnership for Active Living
Redwood Community Action Agency
Housing and Homeless Coalition
Humboldt County Association of Governments
Workforce Investment Board
California Water Resources Board (North Coast Watershed Assessment Program)
City of Arcata
Eureka City Schools
Assembly member Patty Berg’s office
Humboldt Del Norte County Medical Society
Northcoast Environmental Center
Fisheries Biologists
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Arcata Soil Survey Office
PG&E
Department of Health & Human Services

Assessment - VMT Example

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

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

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

VMT: Average vehicle miles traveled per person per day

Assessment - VMT Findings

Alternative A (baseline)
Reduced individual travel expenses and time
Increased transit, walking, and biking

Alternative B
200 million more miles driven in the county annually

Alternative C
400 million miles more
Humboldt Findings

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

Alternative B
Changes current health outcomes least

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

Humboldt Recommendations

Examples of Transportation-related Recommendations

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

Humboldt Reporting

- 40 page summary and six detailed analysis reports reviewed by planners before release
- Presented to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, City Councils, state health officers, hospital grand rounds, APHA and others
- Distributed in newsletter to 22,000 local residents
- Three newspaper articles written about the HIA

Humboldt Outcomes

- No decision yet on General Plan Update
- Recommendations included in Circulation and Housing Elements
- HIA included as appendix to EIS
- Built collaboration between planning & public health agencies
- Built awareness about health and land use among elected officials, general public, planners, community groups
- Other counties interested in using the approach
- Proposed Humboldt Port expansion project will include a HIA
A Health Impact Assessment of Proposed Oil Leasing Activities on Alaska’s North Slope

Project Example 2

Community Health Concerns

A small Inupiat community 7 miles from large oil development.
Over 10 years, wide range of health concerns raised as proposed development drew nearer to the community

“The benefits of oil development are clear -- I don’t deny that for a moment. The negative impacts are more subtle. They’re also more widespread and more costly than most people realize. We know the human impacts of development are significant and long-term. So far, we’ve been left to deal with them on our own. They show up in our health statistics, alcohol treatment programs, emergency service needs, police responses – you name it.”

George Ahmaogak, Former Mayor of North Slope Borough
Keynote Address, Alaska Forum on the Environment 2004

Oil Leasing on Alaska’s North Slope

Keynote Address, Alaska Forum on the Environment 2004

“...I don’t deny that for a moment. The negative impacts are more subtle. They’re also more widespread and more costly than most people realize. We know the human impacts of development are significant and long-term. So far, we’ve been left to deal with them on our own. They show up in our health statistics, alcohol treatment programs, emergency service needs, police responses – you name it.”

George Ahmaogak, Former Mayor of North Slope Borough
Keynote Address, Alaska Forum on the Environment 2004

HIA Process

The First Federal HIA/EIS
Local government became a “cooperating agency” – role defined by NEPA through which local governments can formally participate in an EIS
Community health agency drafted an HIA
Lead federal agency (BLM) incorporated HIA into EIS
Public engagement, assessment, etc. occurred through formal EIS processes, such as response to public comments
**Scoping and Assessment**

**Hunting and Diabetes**

**Baseline:**
Type 2 diabetes prevalence low: ~2.5%
Diet: ~50% “wild foods” – caribou, salmon, marine mammals

**Impact Assessment:**

- Pipelines
- “Seismic”
  - Displace caribou farther from village
  - Fuel & equipment for hunting
- Diets
  - Dietary Change
  - Diabetes Risk
- Revenue

**Recommendations & Outcomes**

**Health Concern**
Need to address health in planning future projects
“Social ills”: alcohol, STIs, etc.

**Mitigation Measure**
BLM will consult with relevant health agencies in the development of future proposals in Northeast NPR-A
Expand cultural orientation for workers

- Air pollution
  - Additional baseline, modeling, and monitoring above CAA requirements
- Contamination of local food sources
  - Baseline levels and ongoing monitoring

**HIA as a Collaborative Process**

**Why engage others in the HIA process?**

- The public for relationship building, capacity for advocacy, and empowerment

- Public health and other agencies for relationship-building, data, information, and resources

- Decision-makers to ensure that recommendations are realistic and account for the practical, economic, and technical limitations on the decision at hand

**Identifying Collaborators**

**Who are the right stakeholders to engage in the HIA process?**

- Public agencies
- Policy-makers / Elected officials
- Community / Advocacy organizations
- Business / Industry
- Residents / Individuals

Any person or organization who has a stake in the decision being assessed is a potential collaborator
Ladder of Participation

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN HIA

Objective
By meaningfully involving potentially impacted communities, ensure that the HIA process, its results, and subsequent actions are as powerful as possible and engage and empower impacted community residents.

Essential Tasks
- Recruit different stakeholders, including community organizations and individuals, to participate in the HIA.
- Ensure that community partners are prepared and have the capacity to participate. Provide leadership development and skills training necessary to support participation.
- Establish shared goals and objectives among stakeholders early in the process.
- Ensure community input at each stage of the HIA process.

Key Points
Community involvement at every stage can enable individuals and organizations to better contribute to, understand, and use HIA results.

Participation in the HIA by a variety of stakeholders, including strong community organizations, will help ensure that HIA findings are as objective as possible. Community groups bring information that complements the perspectives of other HIA stakeholders. It is perceived by many that community organizations lack objectivity, but all stakeholders have some level of bias and can be viewed by other stakeholders as not objective.

Involving community organizations and impacted individuals in the HIA process along with other diverse stakeholders can foster new relationships.

Community partners can play a unique role in using HIA findings and recommendations for advocacy purposes. Other HIA collaborators may have limited capacity to engage in advocacy, but may have the trust of decision-makers. The ability to advocate for the implementation of HIA recommendations and have the trust of decision-makers is crucial to creating change.

Community involvement in health impact assessment can lead to community empowerment. As the WHO Commission on Social Determinants states, "Any serious effort to reduce health inequities will involve political empowerment." Empowerment enables communities to play a role in shaping their living and working conditions, and helps ensure that the changes needed to improve well-being are implemented. Simply having public meetings to inform community members of policy, plan or project changes, or to gather input, does not lead to empowerment.
Key Points (cont’d)

The health lens is an effective frame that can serve to engage community residents in decisions that impact their lives, and can help make community organizations more effective. Assessing local projects and policies that residents are concerned about is an ideal way to highlight links between planning, policy and health. The HIA process and results are effective tools with which to educate community members about decision-making, about the systemic causes of disparities, and about how public decisions impact their health. HIA reporting and communication are opportunities to build leadership through public speaking and meetings with decision-makers. HIA findings can be used by community organizations to support the credibility of their efforts.

Examples of Roles for Community Groups and Impacted Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal Role</th>
<th>More Substantial Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening informed by conditions and needs in the community</td>
<td>Community chooses HIA topic or partners with others to choose topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members inform HIA scope (form of input varies: surveys, meetings)</td>
<td>Community members lead/play substantial role in scoping and prioritizing focus of HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment includes results of community input (surveys, focus groups)</td>
<td>Community conducts research, suggests and prioritizes recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA communication targets a community audience</td>
<td>Community participates in communicating HIA results (testimony, press conferences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government monitors outcomes on behalf of community</td>
<td>Community collects/reports monitoring data themselves or in partnership with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools

The tools page of HIP’s website (www.humanimpact.org/Tools.html) has links to the HIA Toolkit, which includes:

- Structured ways to speak with community groups about how land use planning and public policy affects health are described:
  - The health tree
  - Community mapping exercises

- HIA Readiness Questions, which can help organizations evaluate whether they are ready to undertake a HIA.

- Principles of Collaboration, which can be put in place early in the HIA process to ensure that stakeholders understand how they will work together.
## HIA Opportunities for Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIA Step</th>
<th>Examples of Roles</th>
<th>Potential Collaborators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Process Oversight** | - Stakeholders and HIA practitioners develop a collaboration agreement for the conduct and oversight of the HIA process  
- Identify agency or organization to oversee process  
- Coordinate partners/activities for each step of the HIA process | - Community advocates/organizations  
- Public agencies:  
  - Public health department  
  - Planning department  
- Regulatory agencies (e.g., EPA)  
- Universities  
- School districts  
- HIA consultant |
| **Screening**     | - Identify criteria for selection and priority projects for HIA  
- Identify priority health issues needing to be studied through HIA  
- Understand context of decision-making process  
- Contact stakeholders and decision-makers | |
| **Scoping**       | - Conduct issue identification through outreach to impacted communities  
- Prioritize research questions  
- Conduct outreach to potential HIA participants to broaden the spectrum of stakeholders involved  
- Identify sources of data  
- Establish timeline and boundaries (e.g., geographic, populations)  
- Consider resources available  
- Develop workplan | - Community advocates/organizations  
- Public agencies:  
  - Public health department  
  - Planning department  
- Regulatory agencies (e.g., EPA)  
- Universities  
- School districts  
- HIA consultant |
| **Assessment**    | - Gather and organize data  
- Conduct research and analysis  
- Lead or participate in field observations and research  
- Conduct surveys, interviews or focus groups, and interpret or “ground truth” data and analysis | |
| **Reporting and Communications** | - Write, review and edit final HIA report  
- Interpret and prioritize HIA findings and recommendations  
- Develop presentation of findings  
- Develop and execute communication, media and advocacy plans  
- Create demand for public agencies to conduct HIA | |
| **Monitoring**    | - Monitor decision outcomes and long term results  
- Hold decision-makers accountable to decision agreements | |
Collaborator Roles in HIA

**Scoping**
- Identify health issues to be studied
- Prioritize research questions

**Assessment**
- Research existing conditions data
- Conduct surveys, interviews, focus groups, interpret and ground truth data
- Conduct data analysis
- Prioritize recommendations

**Reporting**
- Write, review and edit final report
- Develop a communication, media and advocacy plan to report findings to decision-makers

**Recommendations**
- Develop and prioritize alternatives or mitigation strategies
- Identify strategies to ensure implementation of recommendations (e.g., collaboration with decision-maker to develop feasible measures; advocacy; media)

**Monitoring**
- Continue to hold decision-makers accountable for decision agreements and mitigations

See “Opportunities for Stakeholder Collaboration in HIA” in your binder

Opportunities for Decision-maker Input

**Scoping**
- Participate in early discussion of HIA and HIA training with other stakeholders

**Assessment**
- Share constraints, concerns, practical limitations

**Recommendations**
- Develop shared understanding of analysis being conducted

**Reporting**
- Identify what policymakers can feasibly implement

**Monitoring**
- Review and utilize HIA findings and recommendations
- Consider ways to require monitoring

Examples of HIA Collaboration

**Humboldt County General Plan HIA**

**Organization**
- Public Health Department
- Community organization (HumPal)
- Planning Department
- HIP

**Roles**
- Contributed data and conducted research/analysis
- Reported HIA findings and recommendations
- Organized focus groups for scoping and assessment
- Reviewed HIA report and findings
- Participated in scoping focus groups
- Provided baseline data
- Reviewed HIA process
- Conducted HIA assessment
- Drafted report

**Humboldt County General Plan HIA**

**Hawai‘i County Agricultural Development Plan HIA**
Agriculture in Hawaii County

Hawai‘i County is the site of 63% of farmland and 40% of existing farm employment in the state. The effect of agricultural expansion on the island’s economy could be significant. State of Hawai‘i island imports 85-90% of its food (Hawai‘i island imports less). The legacy of former plantation agriculture and the result of globalization of food supply.

Economic impact of increase in local food production is more often discussed, but health impacts of this plan have not been evaluated.

Hawai‘i County Ag. Development Plan

Plan currently being developed by County of Hawai‘i Department of Research and Development.

Plan currently focuses on enhancing opportunities for expansion of County’s agricultural industry.

Residents interested in expanding locally produced food supply to address issues of food security, economic development, and environmental conservation.

Plan will guide County legislative and regulatory action, as well as decisions about private investment by agricultural business, for five or more years.

Agricultural Plan HIA

Potential impacts of Ag. Plan:
- Food security
- Economic stability
- Worker safety
- Environmental impact

HIA used to:
- Assess risks and benefits of Plan
- Highlight issues of social and economic equity
- Develop recommendations to promote benefits and mitigate danger to health
- Report results to decision-makers and general public
- Positively impact community well-being

HIA Goals

Include health considerations in the Ag. Plan decision-making processes.

Succeed in developing a Plan that reflects community priorities.

Engage and involve community stakeholders throughout the HIA.

Promote alternatives that will maximize health benefits and mitigate negative health impacts.

Build capacity of stakeholders to use HIA findings and recommendations to assist in education and awareness building around the health impacts of policy and land use decisions.
Step 1: Screening

Objective
To decide whether a HIA is feasible, timely, and would add value to the decision-making process.

Tasks
Key points
Tools
Resources
STEP 1: SCREENING

Objective
To decide whether a HIA is feasible, timely, and would add value to the decision-making process.

Key Points

**HIA is used to assess a defined project, plan, or policy.** The purpose of HIA is to inform decision-makers before they make a decision. A HIA is most often carried out before a decision is made or the proposal is implemented.

**Have sufficient information about the decision.** Conducting a HIA requires sufficient information about the proposed policy or plan to evaluate health impacts. Vague plans or policy statements may provide too little substance for a HIA.

**Establish the value of HIA.** It is not possible or desirable to conduct a HIA on every public decision. Projects that benefit from HIA are those where such an analysis might significantly protect or promote the health of a population and where partners are engaged in the HIA process and will use the results.

**Assess feasibility.** Feasibility involves being able to conduct an informative HIA within the decision-making time frame and with available resources.

**Understand timing.** Conducting a HIA early in the design and decision-making process offers the best opportunity for influencing the design of the project, plan, or policy. If the HIA occurs too late in the process, it risks confronting a fixed design or closed positions.

**Evaluate decision openness.** For HIA to be most valuable, the decision-making process should be open to receiving and acting on new information.

**Be inclusive.** Have community groups, public agencies and other potential HIA collaborators participate in the screening process. Participation of stakeholders in the HIA process at the earliest possible stage can help to ensure buy-in, constructive dialogue, and openness to HIA findings and recommendations.

**Avoid redundancy.** A HIA may be less useful if health effects related to the decision are already well established, or if another impact assessment or analysis will serve to comprehensively analyze health impacts.

Essential Tasks

- Define the decision and its alternatives
- Decide who will be involved in screening
- Determine if potential partners are ready to work on a HIA
- Evaluate the project, plan, or policy based on screening criteria
- Make a decision about whether to conduct a HIA
- Notify stakeholders of your decision
Tools

Example Screening Criteria

1. The project, plan or policy has been proposed, a final decision about whether to adopt the proposal has not been made, and there is sufficient time to conduct an analysis before the decision is made.

2. The decision has the potential to affect, positively or negatively, environmental or social determinants of health that impact health outcomes of a population - and those health impacts are not being or likely to be considered without the HIA.

3. Evidence, expertise, and/or research methods exist to analyze health impacts associated with the decision being considered.

4. The proposal being considered could potentially impact health inequities.

5. The proposal’s impact on health outcomes is potentially significant. This can be measured in terms of the number of people impacted, the magnitude of impacts, and the breadth of the impacts.

6. The connections between the proposal and health outcomes are neither too obvious nor too indirect.

7. Decision-makers and/or those stakeholders who have the capacity to influence decision-makers are likely to use HIA findings and recommendations to inform or influence the decision-making process, whether through regulatory requirements or voluntarily.

8. The HIA could help lead to institutional and/or systemic changes that promote better health outcomes for all.

9. Partners are available to participate in the HIA process and use HIA findings and recommendations.

10. Resources (including funding, personnel, technical capacity, and leadership) are available to conduct the HIA.

Resources


When is a HIA carried out?

The purpose of HIA is to inform decision-makers before they make decisions. A HIA is most often carried out prospectively - before the decision is made or the policy is implemented.

HIA is used to assess a defined project, plan or policy

Why NOT do a HIA? Example 1

A plan to improve walkability in Chula Vista, CA

Plan was already considering health
Little opportunity to develop useful recommendations
Health advocates involved in design
Resources better focused elsewhere

Why NOT do a HIA? Example 2

Proposed WalMart distribution center, Merced, CA

Idea for the HIA came just before final EIA was released
Elected officials not open to considering health
Health advocates recommendations were being ignored
Resources better used to explore legal options and support the election of more health focused officials

HIA Screening Worksheet

See worksheet in binder
What specific recommendations included in the Plan should be a priority focus for the HIA?

What would be the health effects of:
- a general commercial expansion of FFV production
- an expansion of grass fed beef, dairy, and/or egg production
- an increase in the production of organic FFVP
  - an increase in home food production
  - extensive biofuel production
  - increase in farm workers/being a farm worker
  - an increase in new on-farm housing
  - an increase in institutional buying, particularly by pre-schools and K-12 schools?
- What are the most effective ways to increase demand for/consumption of FFVP?
## HIA Screening Worksheet

### Screening Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Questions</th>
<th>Response and Supporting Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project, plan or policy <strong>has been proposed</strong>, a final decision about whether to adopt the proposal <strong>has not been made</strong>, and there is <strong>sufficient time</strong> to conduct an analysis before the decision is made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What specific recommendations included in the Ag. Plan should be a priority focus for the HIA?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the decision have the potential to affect, positively or negatively, environmental or social determinants of health that impact health outcomes of a population? Would health inequities be impacted? In what ways? What are the most important health concerns that could be addressed by a HIA?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would those health impacts be considered without an HIA?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the proposal too closely, or too distantly related to health? If applied, would HIA findings and recommendations potentially improve the impact that the project, plan, or policy has on health?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who are the stakeholders and interest groups involved in the decision-making process? Do they seem to have the interest and the capacity to participate in an HIA? Would stakeholders use the HIA to inform or influence the decision-making process? How?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are some challenges (and by what stakeholders) to change that you might anticipate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other screening questions to consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the decision-making process open to HIA and/or recommendations for changes to design, mitigations and alternatives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there decision alternatives that are more or less advantageous to public health? Would one scenario affect vulnerable populations more than another?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have public concerns about the health impacts of the decision been documented (even if these concerns have not explicitly been stated as health concerns)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the proposal’s impacts to health significant in terms of the number of people impacted, the magnitude, breadth and immediacy of impacts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do data and research methods exist to analyze health impacts of concern associated with this decision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it feasible to analyze the health impacts of the decision in the decision-making time frame? What are some barriers to timely completion that you might anticipate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the HIA help lead to institutional and/or systemic change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What additional information do you need to decide on the overall value of an HIA in this context?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choosing a Specific focus for the HIA: 
linking HIA issues with the County of Hawai’i Agricultural Development Plan

What would be the health effects of:

- a general commercial expansion of FFV production
- an expansion of grass fed beef, dairy, and/or egg production
- an increase in the production of organic FFVP
- an increase in home food production
- extensive biofuel production
- increase in farm workers/being a farm worker
- an increase in new on-farm housing
- an increase in institutional buying, particularly by pre-schools and K-12 schools?

What are the most effective ways to increase demand for/consumption of FFVP?

Expansion of commercial FFV production, Expansion of grass fed beef, dairy, and/or egg production, Increase in home food production, Increase in the production of organic FFVP

- “Recommended goals that reflect the expressed wishes of the agricultural industry and community members . . . . Expand Hawaii Island food production so that 30% of its residents demand for food can be supplied by local producers by 2020”. (Page 2)
- “Increase the local production of food consumed on Hawaii Island by growing and marketing commercial crops to substitute those being imported and by encouraging island residents to grow some of their own produce.” (Page 25)
- “Recommended goals that reflect the expressed wishes of the agricultural industry and community members . . . . Protect local agriculture from the introduction of invasive species and pathogens.” (Page 2)
- “One of the best strategies to control invasive species is to increase Hawaii’s agricultural production . . . . decrease importation of agricultural products that are a main source of invasive pests.” (Page 42)

Increase in institutional buying, particularly by pre-schools and K-12 schools

- “Increase the profitability of Hawaii Island’s agricultural businesses through cost reduction strategies and greater market share for local products. Proposed Action items: (1) Sales to county, state, and federal agencies—lead by example.” (Page 23)

Expansion of grass fed beef and/or dairy production, Extensive biofuel production

- “Challenges [to expanded beef production]: Competition for grazing land among other agricultural users, especially planned bioenergy crops, has the potential to be a limiting factor.” (Page 46)
- “Challenges [to biofuel production]: There is competition for the large acreages of agricultural land needed for biofuel resource growth. There is a limited amount of economic data available on the profitability of growing, harvesting, and processing biofuels on Hawaii Island.” (Page 69)

Increase in new on-farm housing

- County zoning laws related to housing on agricultural land can be an impediment to farming. . . . Clustering of farm labor housing or the use of barrack-type facilities are needed if agriculture is to expand. . . . Similarly there should be legal ways for young family farmers to move on to land with minimal residential infrastructure, allowing for . . . improvements to be built as agricultural activity grows and becomes profitable. Objective: . . . simplify permitting for farm dwellings and farm worker housing. (Page 32)
What are the most effective ways to increase demand for/consumption of FFVP? (Pick a specific strategy such as expanding farmers markets, taking EBT cards at farmers markets, placement of local products in markets, etc.)

- Objective: Increase awareness and sales of Hawaii Island’s crops and value-added products for local consumption . . . with effective marketing strategies. (Page 27)
The HIA Process

- Screening
- Scoping
- Assessment
- Recommendations
- Reporting
- Monitoring

Step 2: Scoping

**Objective**
To create a plan and timeline for conducting a HIA that defines priority issues, research questions and methods, and participant roles.

**Tasks**

**Key points**

**Tools**

**Resources**
STEP 2: SCOPING

Objective

To create a plan and timeline for conducting a HIA that defines priority issues, research questions and methods, and participant roles.

Essential Tasks

- Determine who will oversee the HIA process
- Set ground rules or principles of collaboration for working together, including participant roles
- Establish objectives of the HIA
- Develop research questions, workplan, and timeline
- Determine the format for the final HIA report, and how findings and recommendations will be communicated

Key Points

To set the scope, determine:
- Decision alternatives to be evaluated
- Potential health impacts of the decision and health issues to be considered in the HIA
- Populations to be evaluated, including vulnerable populations defined by place, income, race, gender, or age
- Research questions, data sources, and analytic methods
- Timelines
- Draft plans for reporting, monitoring, and evaluation
- Resources available
- Participant roles and responsibilities

Be inclusive. Include all stakeholders in scoping and other steps of the HIA. Stakeholders include community and advocacy groups, public health and other government agencies, project proponents, elected officials, and affected community members.

Use diverse outreach methods to solicit feedback and participation from a variety of stakeholders by hosting a public meeting, receiving public comments, interviewing stakeholders and experts, or inviting input from local health experts.

The scope should reflect resources available. Begin with an understanding of the broad set of health determinants that could be impacted by the decision. Then, consider the resources needed to apply methodologies and tools to define a realistic workplan.

Resource requirements for HIA analysis methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least resources</th>
<th>Most resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>New quantitative data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and mapping of existing data</td>
<td>Application of quantitative forecasting methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert opinion</td>
<td>Interviews or focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of quantitative forecasting methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews or focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New quantitative data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Points (cont’d)

Consider all pathways that link the proposed decision to health. Focus on impacts with greatest significance and greatest public concern. Use pathway diagrams:

Tools

Example Scoping Questions
- What are the goals for this HIA?
- What are potential health impacts of the proposed project or policy? Which of these will be included in the scope?
- What is known about existing health conditions of the populations that could be impacted? What are the specific populations (e.g., age, gender, race, income, place) that will be impacted?
- What research questions will the HIA answer?
- What research methods and data sources will be used?
- Who will oversee the HIA process?
- What roles will stakeholders and collaborators play?
- What is the workplan and timeline?

Resources

The tools page of HIP’s website (www.humanimpact.org/Tools.html) has links to HIP’s HIA Toolkit, which includes examples of a land use development project scope (Concord, CA Naval Weapons Station) and HIP’s Principles of Collaboration.
Health Determinants

Potential health impacts to focus on in the HIA

Nutrition
Family Income
Economic Development and Job Creation
Transportation (for residents, for ag. products)
Housing
Social Capital

Causal Pathways

A Pathway Diagram demonstrates the links between health determinants and outcomes.

HIA Scoping: Table Exercise

Considering your Ag. Plan policy rec. and one health determinant of concern, develop a Pathway Diagram

Using the same recommendation and health determinant, complete the Scoping Worksheet (first 4 columns)

Consider a goal for your HIA related to this issue area

HIA Scoping Worksheet

See worksheet in binder
Completing the Scoping Worksheet

Health Determinant
Access to fresh produce

Existing Conditions
% of adults and % of children who eat recommended daily servings of fresh fruits and vegetables
Proportion of population in varying distances (.5 miles, 1 mile etc.) from fresh produce retail
Cost of available fresh produce

Potential Impacts
Obesity, other chronic conditions, economic (including $ available for other needs)

Completing the Scoping Worksheet (cont’d)

Vulnerable Populations
low socioeconomic status, families with children, those with lack of access to transportation

Research Questions
How many Farmer’s Markets currently exist on Hawai’i?
How would the Ag. Plan proposal potentially increase number of Farmer’s Markets and how would that impact residents’ access to fresh food?
How would FM impact social capital? What are the economic impacts of FMs?
How many servings of fruits and vegetables (and protein?) does the average Hawaii Island resident eat?
How would the Ag Plan impact intake of fresh produce and protein?

Small Group Scoping Assignments

Table 1
Ag. Plan Recommendation:
Health Issue:

Table 2
Ag. Plan Recommendation:
Health Issue:

Table 3
Ag. Plan Recommendation:
Health Issue:

Table 4
Ag. Plan Recommendation:
Health Issue:
HIA Training
Scoping Exercise

1. Review the Scoping worksheet below.

2. Within the context of your case study scenario, consider one health determinant that would be prioritized in a HIA for this proposed project, plan or policy.

3. Describe potential pathways from the proposed project, plan or policy to changes in social and environmental conditions that lead to the health issues you’ve selected (draw a “pathway diagram”).

4. For each health determinant, write down some of what you already know about existing conditions and evidence related to potential health impacts. Identify vulnerable or sensitive populations that might be impacted by the proposed project, plan or policy.

5. For each health determinant, define important research questions that will need to be answered in the HIA.

The following are common themes that come up for communities with regard to health and policy proposals. Feel free to investigate other topics not listed here as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure employment</th>
<th>Air pollution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job quality &amp; safety</td>
<td>Environmental noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and accessibility of housing</td>
<td>Access to parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of nutrition</td>
<td>Preservation of open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to goods &amp; services</td>
<td>Traffic safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; child development</td>
<td>Community violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection of community cohesion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HIA Scoping Worksheet – Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health determinant</th>
<th>What do we already know about existing conditions, potential health impacts and vulnerable populations?</th>
<th>What are the specific populations (e.g., age, gender, race and income) that will be impacted by this project/policy proposal?</th>
<th>What are our research questions?</th>
<th>What methods or data sources could help answer the research questions? What agencies might provide access to this data?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the development furnish sufficient <strong>affordable and safe housing?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing conditions:</strong> There is insufficient supply and production of low to moderate income housing in the area. 20% of households live in overcrowded conditions. <strong>Potential impacts:</strong> Public health evidence links overcrowding, financial strain, and displacement to respiratory disease, stress, child abuse and neglect, and a multitude of physical and mental health issues including premature mortality.</td>
<td><strong>Vulnerable populations:</strong> Existing low-income and minority populations living in the development area. Many families with children are living in overcrowded conditions.</td>
<td>How many renters/owners, by income category, spend greater than 30% of their income on housing? <strong>According to federal guidelines, housing is considered to be affordable when residents spend less than 30% of their income on housing.</strong> How does housing cost and income relate to housing conditions? How do these housing conditions impact health?</td>
<td>Data on housing availability by housing cost from city planning agencies. Data on housing quality in development area from health and building authorities. Data on housing-related illnesses and injuries from health department. Research linking housing conditions with specific health outcomes. Interviews with area residents on housing conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# HIA Scoping Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health determinant</th>
<th>What do we already know about existing conditions, potential health impacts and vulnerable populations?</th>
<th>What are the specific populations (e.g., age, gender, race and income) that will be impacted by this project/policy proposal?</th>
<th>What are our research questions?</th>
<th>What methods or data sources could help answer the research questions? What agencies might provide access to this data?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3: Assessment & Recommendations

Objective
To provide a profile of existing conditions data, an evaluation of potential health impacts, and evidence-based recommendations to mitigate negative and maximize positive health impacts.

Tasks
Key points
Tools
Resources
STEP 3: ASSESSMENT & RECOMMENDATIONS

Objective
To provide a profile of existing conditions data, an evaluation of potential health impacts, and evidence-based recommendations to mitigate negative and maximize positive health impacts.

Essential Tasks
- **Profile Existing Conditions**
  Research baseline conditions, including health outcomes and determinants of health disaggregated by income, race, gender, age, and place.

- **Evaluate Potential Health Impacts**
  Use theory, baseline conditions, and population concerns. Consider evidence that supports and refutes health impacts. Assess affects by income, race, gender, age, and place. Include assessments of the certainty, significance, and equity of impacts. Justify the selection or exclusion of data/methods. Identify data gaps, uncertainties, and limitations. Allow stakeholders to critique findings.

- **Propose Evidence-based Recommendations**
  Gathered from experts and prioritized by HIA stakeholders.

Key Points
- **Gather existing data and collect primary data when necessary.** Data sources include:
  - empirical literature
  - community expertise
  - available social, economic, environmental, and health measures and surveys, often available from public health and planning agencies
  - regulatory criteria, standards, checklists and benchmarks
  - focus groups and community surveys
  - neighborhood assessment tools

- **It is necessary to profile baseline conditions in order to predict future conditions if a project, plan, or policy is enacted.**

- **Conduct a literature review.** Clarify the question of interest and data needs, develop criteria for included studies, identify literature databases, identify studies and reviews, evaluate studies, and document your findings.

- **Include direction, magnitude and quality of evidence in impact predictions.**

Don’t start from scratch. Use tools and methods that already exist to assess health conditions and potential impacts.

Predicting health impacts with absolute certainty is not possible. Make informed judgments of effects based on available information, analysis, expertise, and experience. Be cautious with generalizations. Acknowledge assumptions and limitations.

It is not always necessary to quantify health impacts. Pathways between decisions and health effects are complex and quantification does not mean causal certainty. Assess a health impact by evaluating how a decision would affect environmental conditions known to be important to health.

Use qualitative analysis for issues that don’t lend themselves to quantitative forecasting.

Different approaches used together can support better judgments. Use lay and expert knowledge and analysis using different methods (such as GIS mapping and surveys) collectively to draw conclusions.
Key Points (cont’d)

Answer the following questions for quantitative forecasting:
- Is there a causal relationship?
- Does data allow for quantitative predictions?
- Would prospective predictions be valid?
- Is there available time and resources?
- Would quantification support the needs of the decision-making process?

Methods for collecting new data include:
- Environmental measures (e.g., pedestrian quality, retail access)
- Modeling (e.g., air quality, noise)
- Surveys
- Forecasting tools (e.g., pedestrian injuries)
- Epidemiological studies

Recommendations include alternative ways to design a project, plan, or policy or management strategies to lessen adverse health effects.

Recommendations are not always appropriate. A HIA of a policy may simply state the potential benefits or harms without recommending changes.

Consider the following criteria for recommendations. They should be:
- Responsive to predicted impacts
- Specific and actionable
- Experience-based and effective
- Enforceable
- Can be monitored
- Technically feasible
- Politically feasible
- Economically efficient
- Do not introduce additional negative consequences

Resources

San Francisco Department of Public Health. Program on Health, Equity and Sustainability. The Healthy Development Measurement Tool: Recommendations and Mitigations. Available at: www.thehdmt.org


HIP’s Toolkit has a list of HIA Data Sources for Baseline Profiles of Health
HIA Assessment

Profile existing conditions: what do health conditions look like right now?
Through existing data or collecting new data

Judging impacts: how are current health conditions going to change for better or for worse?
What methods can be used to predict impacts?

Developing recommendations: how can we avoid negative health impacts and ensure that the Plan benefits health?

HIA Assessment Methods

Conduct an empirical literature review
Gather existing data or conduct new analysis on health, environmental and social indicators
Compare data to existing regulatory criteria, standards, & benchmarks
Utilize community expertise - e.g., focus groups, surveys
Apply specialized data collection tools for observational data, forecasting, and modeling

Empirical Literature Review

Based on the Official USDA Thrifty Food Plans in 2009, the weekly food budget at home for a family of four in Hawai‘i was $217.70, which is higher by about 63% than the national average of $133.40

Residents of low-income neighborhoods disproportionately suffer from problems of food insecurity. Limited access to healthy foods can result in problems of under- and over-nutrition; a deficiency of vital nutrients and calories can lead to underweight and an increased risk of illness, while an excess of poor quality energy sources can result in problems associated with being overweight and obese.

Indicator Data Sources

United States Census Bureau, American Fact Finder
Population data on demographics, social and economic characteristics, at state, county, city, zip code, census tract, block group, and block level

Centers for Disease Control, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System
The world’s largest, on-going telephone health survey system, tracking health conditions and risk behaviors in the U.S.; data are collected monthly

Public Agencies
Hawai‘i Dept. of Health, County Dept. of Research & Development, Hawai‘i Dept. of Agriculture, Planning, Transportation

See HI Specific Data Sources in the “HIA Data Sources” doc.
Hawai'i Health Survey, 2008

Obesity Prevalence Hawaii Island

Age-Adjusted Prevalence of Diabetes, 1994-2004

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Regulatory Criteria, Standards, and Benchmarking Tools

Useful tools when available
Can simplify analysis
Reflects health analysis and other considerations
May not be health protective
May not be agreement on criteria

Healthy People 2010: Increase the proportion of persons aged 2 years and older who consume at least two daily servings of fruit

Hawaii County General Plan (2005): Development should be reviewed on the basis of total impact on the residents of the County, not only in terms of immediate short run economic benefits.
Community Expertise

Residents
Neighborhood organizations
Medical practitioners
Public officials
Health agencies

“We need an Ag. Plan that includes an emphasis on self-reliance and sustainability. The County should have ways to stimulate agriculture with properly designed policy that is alignment with state and federal polices.”

Focus Groups

Focus groups provide personal experiences to accompany statistics

“Working in a hospital, let alone in a hospital kitchen, you’d think they wouldn’t want us to come in. Oh, no. If you try to call out, they give you a hard time. You come in sick and the next day, three more people are sick.”

Surveys can help provide information that cannot be found in other data sources

For example
What is the health status of the community?
What are residents perceptions of environmental conditions and community needs?
What is the likely effect of a change in policy?

Specialized Assessment Tools

Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index
Air Quality Modeling
Noise Modeling
Pedestrian Injury Collision Modeling
Healthy Development Measurement Tool
RFEI
Retail Food Availability Survey

85% of U.S. private sector food service workers do not have paid sick days
586 food-borne disease outbreaks in institutional settings from '03 - '07 involved infected food-handlers
Healthy Development Measurement Tool

www.thehdmt.org

Used to support comprehensive and health responsive planning
Incorporates over 120 measurable community health indicators and development targets

Retail Food Environment Index

RFEI = 
# fast food restaurants + 
# convenience stores
# supermarkets + 
# produce stores + 
# farmer’s markets

Retail Food Availability Survey

Assesses availability of healthy foods within stores, and therefore within neighborhoods, to determine community food security
Survey consists of store- and food-related measures such as
store type
price
availability and variety
quality
organic produce
store characteristics (e.g., cleanliness), and
demographic information
Available at sfphes.org/HIA_Tools_Retail_Food_Availability.htm

Example: Pittsburg HIA

Assessment Method | Sample Finding
---|---
Indicator | 17.5 asthma hospitalizations per 100,000
Empirical literature | 8.4% of residents commute to work via public transportation
Specialized tool | In a recent survey of County residents, 45% felt that transportation issues are the most pressing issue in County.
Specialized tool | PEQI: 42 intersections and 47 street segments assessed; Scores ranged from 0 (unsuitable pedestrian environment) to 75 (nearly ideal pedestrian conditions).
Specialized tool | Air Quality Modeling: Substantial local air pollution exposures for the future plan area attributed to the project location. However, comparing traffic generated from a low-density residential alternative to this high-density TOD project, the health impacts of premature deaths, asthma hospitalizations, and lower respiratory symptoms were 41% higher than in the eBART scenario.
Assessment Exercise

What methods or data sources could help answer the research questions?
What agencies might provide access to these data?

For the access to fresh produce example
Data on consumption of fresh produce from national or locally based surveys
Data on location of farmers markets, populations in surrounding areas, transportation access to markets
Interviews with area residents about access to fresh produce
Health Impact Assessment Training Evaluation Form - Day 1

June 23, 2010
Waimea, Hawaii

Thank you for attending the HIA training presented by Human Impact Partners, The Health Impact Project and The Kohala Center. Please take a moment to answer the questions below. Your comments and suggestions are very valuable to us.

Please rate the following statements listed below by circling the appropriate rating (1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neutral; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Your Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The content presented today deepened my understanding of the subject and HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will use the knowledge/skills gained from today’s session in my future work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What did you particularly like or dislike about the content of today’s training?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Are there things that we should have covered today but did not?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. Are there things that we should have spent less time on today?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Please rate the different sections of the training on a scale of 1-5

(1 = awful to 5 = excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Your Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Tree Exercise (making the connection between land-use, policy and health)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Introduction to HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HIA Project Examples</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. HIA as a Collaborative Process</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Goals for the Ag. Plan HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Step 1: Screening</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Step 2: Scoping</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Step 3: Assessment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
DAY 2 OBJECTIVES:
- Discuss the process of developing HIA Recommendations and Mitigations
- Learn about the Reporting step in HIA and types of reporting and communication strategies to target different audiences
- Discuss how and when monitoring and evaluation has been used in HIA
- Discuss intervention points in decision making processes for the Hawaii County Agricultural Development Plan where HIA findings and recommendations can be used
- Develop messages to communicate about the Hawaii County Agricultural Development Plan HIA to key stakeholders and decision-makers
- Plan for next steps to move forward with the HIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Welcome and Introduction to Day 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Open Discussion With Any Questions from Day 1, “Sticking Points” in HIA, and Strategies to Address These</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>HIA Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Considering How the HIA Can be Used to Influence the Ag. Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Reporting in HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>Communicating with Key Stakeholders about the HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Monitoring in HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>HIA Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>Next Steps and Plan for Moving Forward with the HIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Reflections and Training Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review: Day 1

Connections between ag policy, land use and health

Examples of completed HIAs

Opportunities for collaboration in HIA

HIA Goals

Step 1: Screening

Step 2: Scoping

Step 3: Assessment

Agenda: Day 2

8:30 Coffee
9:00 Welcome and introduction to day 2
9:15 Questions from day 1 & “HIA Sticking Points”
9:45 HIA Recommendations
10:15 Considering ways the HIA can be used to influence the Ag. Plan
11:00 Break
11:10 HIA reporting
11:40 Communicating with key stakeholders about the HIA
12:30 Lunch
1:30 HIA Monitoring
2:00 HIA Evaluation
2:30 Break
2:40 Next steps and plan for moving forward with the HIA
3:15 Wrap-up
3:30 Reflections and training evaluation
3:45 Adjourn

Addressing HIA “Sticking Points”

What do the critics say about HIA?

What are some of the barriers and solutions to implementing a HIA practice?

How do HIA and advocacy fit together?

What the Critics Say

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIA is costly</td>
<td>Not as costly as treatment of health impacts in the long run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA is time-consuming and will slow decision-making processes</td>
<td>Conducting the HIA early will bring issues to the front of the decision-making process, potentially speeding approval processes and preventing costly litigation that delays projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA will stop economic development</td>
<td>The role of HIA is to identify mitigations and recommendations, not to say “don’t do that”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA is not scientific</td>
<td>Role of HIA is to pull together disparate pieces of evidence to make a broad statement about impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Barriers and Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Example solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No funding for HIA</td>
<td>Use funding sources creatively (e.g., SFDPH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need a champion decision-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need examples from other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors will be upset by Public Health Department’s HIA work</td>
<td>Need successful case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of public health agency is to protect the public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff do not have to take an advocacy position, but can weigh in with evidence and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certain issues are not thought of as “advocacy” (e.g., tobacco and breastfeeding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not enough evidence to demonstrate health impacts</td>
<td>Disparate, single-issue focused evidence exists in public health literature, especially built environment-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of HIA is to pull together to make a broad and definitive statement about impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIA and Advocacy

There are different roles in HIA and not all partners must do all aspects of the HIA.

**Transit-Oriented Development HIA**
- Community group: Held meeting with public agencies and city and provided community education
- Health Department: Testified about health impacts
- Human Impact Partners: Presented to community about HIA

**Redevelopment HIA**
- Community group: Wrote and distributed press release organized residents to come to city council meetings
- Health Department: Wrote letter to City Council about health impacts
- Human Impact Partners: Held meetings with redevelopment and advocated for health analysis in EIS

### The HIA Process

- Screening
- Scoping
- Assessment
- **Recommendations**
- Reporting
- Monitoring

### Recommendations & Mitigations

A key function of HIA is to identify opportunities for public decisions to promote health

**HIA may suggest**

- **Recommendations**: alternative ways to design a project, plan, or policy its location, or timing to benefit health
- **Mitigations**: strategies to lessen anticipated adverse health effects of a decision
Recommendations & Mitigations

Key Points

Recommendations should be tied to indicators that can be monitored

Recommendations should be supported by evidence

Recommended mitigation measures may require skills and expertise from outside the HIA team

Potential impacts of recommendations and mitigation measures could also be assessed as part of the HIA

All stakeholders do not need to be advancing identified recommendations

Recommendations & Mitigations: Examples

Humboldt HIA: Encourage large employers to adopt TDM programs; Design multi-modal transit hub with co-located businesses and housing; Re: VMT: Alternative A = best for health, Alternative C = most negative for health

South LA Housing: Establish transportation for residents to healthy food retail; Establish farmer’s market at local housing or school site; Offer incentives for healthy food retail to fill commercial site at housing development

Alaska: BLM will consult with relevant health agencies in the development of future proposals in Northeast NPR-A; Expand cultural orientation for workers; Additional baseline, modeling, and monitoring above CAA requirements; Baseline levels and ongoing monitoring

Consider the following criteria in developing recommendations:

- Responsive to predicted impacts
- Specific and actionable
- Experience-based and effective
- Enforceable
- Can be monitored
- Technically feasible
- Politically feasible
- Economically efficient
- Do not introduce additional negative consequences

Challenges in Developing Recommendations

Validation of proposed recommendations and impacts on health

Limited knowledge of potential recommendations

Cost element to implement recommendations

Coming to consensus on recommendations

Responses

Use best available evidence

Invite subject-area expert input

Cost of not implementing in terms of health outcomes and associated expenses

Develop stakeholder outreach process to “test” recommendations
**HIA Intervention Points**

- Screening
- Scoping
- Assessment
- Recommendations
- Reporting
- Monitoring

**Typical Contexts for HIA**

**Voluntary**
Initiated by public health practitioner, policy advocate, affected stakeholders, responsible public agency, or policy-maker

**Regulatory**
Required by project specific legislation, to comply with EIA requirements, or other HIA regulation

NEPA is the only legal requirement for conducting health analyses in public decisions. Historically, EIAs have not done this well. HIA is used to influence decision-making processes within or outside of the EIA process.

**Land Use & Decision-Making Processes**

- General/Comprehensive Plans: Humboldt County
- Area Plans/Specific Plans: Pittsburg TOD
- Zoning: Baltimore zoning code
- Infrastructure Plans: I-170 Freeway expansion
- Public Lands Management: Alaska oil exploration
- Development Project Review Process: Jack London Gateway
- Environmental Impact Assessment: Alaska, Humboldt
- Request for Proposals: Oakland Estuary

**Ag. Plan Decision-Makers**

- Hawai'i County Department of Research and Development (R&D) charged with creating the Plan
- Hawai'i County Council will vote on adoption of the Plan and consider legislative and regulatory action on Plan recommendations
- Hawai'i County administration will implement laws and regulations in consultation with a County Agricultural Plan Policy Advisory Committee made up of local residents from the islands' agricultural sector
- Agricultural stakeholders make decisions about private investment
- Opinion leaders and media can advocate for public policy changes and public investments
Decision-Making in Hawaii County

Mayor
County Council
Departments:
  Research and Development
  Planning Department
  Public Works
  Office of Housing and Community Development
  Mass Transit Agency
  Parks and Recreation

Intervention Points, Timeline for Ag Plan HIA

Step 4: Reporting

Objective
To develop the HIA report and communicate findings and recommendations.

Tasks
Key points
Tools
Resources

The HIA Process

Screening
  Scoping
  Assessment
  Recommendations
  Reporting
  Monitoring
STEP 4: REPORTING

Objective
To develop the HIA report and communicate findings and recommendations.

Essential Tasks

Develop the HIA Report
• Develop a consensus among stakeholders regarding key findings and recommendations
• Determine the format and structure of the report
• Write the report

Communicate HIA Findings and Recommendations
• Develop a communication plan
• Prepare communication materials to suit the needs of all stakeholders in the decision-making process
• Send communication materials to stakeholders and decision-makers

Key Points

A HIA report summarizes key health issues the proposal could impact and provides recommendations to improve health outcomes and determinants.

When available, regulatory processes (e.g., Environmental Impact Assessment) can be used to report findings and recommendations.

The HIA report:
• Identifies all HIA participants and their contributions
• Documents the process for each of the HIA steps, including criteria for prioritizing recommendations
• Details for health issues analyzed: available scientific evidence, data sources and analytic methods and rationale, existing conditions, results, predicted health impacts and their significance, and corresponding recommendations for improving health
• Should be made readily accessible for public review and comment

Report formats include: formal structured written reports, comment letters on environmental impact reports, and presentations.

Summarize the full report into clear, succinct messages that allow all stakeholders to understand, evaluate, and respond to findings and recommendations.

Frame messages to help people relate to the information. Frames help people make sense of information by triggering familiar concepts.

Develop messages regarding overall magnitude of health benefits, benefits to vulnerable populations, feasibility of solutions, and public concerns.

Interest groups and media can support effective translation of results into action.

Methods of communication include:
• Letters to decision-makers
• Fact sheets
• Public testimony
• Presentations to key audiences
• Panel discussions
• Press conferences

Good communication throughout the HIA process can engage stakeholders and lead to greater acceptance of findings and recommendations.
### Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Impact Assessment</th>
<th>Method of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt County General Plan Update Health Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Newsletter; Powerpoint presentation to Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.humanimpact.org/HumboldtGPU.html">http://www.humanimpact.org/HumboldtGPU.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord Naval Weapons Station Reuse HIA, Executive &amp; Chapter Summaries</td>
<td>Briefing Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.humanimpact.org/CNWS/">http://www.humanimpact.org/CNWS/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDPH Comment on the Scope of the Trinity Plaza Redevelopment Draft Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>Comment Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.sfphes.org/publications/comments/Comment_on_Trinity_DEIR_scope.pdf">http://www.sfphes.org/publications/comments/Comment_on_Trinity_DEIR_scope.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Transportation Policy HIA</td>
<td>Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.upstreampublichealth.org/HIA_FactSheet_Trans_OR.pdf">http://www.upstreampublichealth.org/HIA_FactSheet_Trans_OR.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources

For examples of reports and other communication materials, see HIP’s website: [http://www.humanimpact.org/Projects.html](http://www.humanimpact.org/Projects.html)

For information on framing and media see:

- The Praxis Project: [http://www.thepraxisproject.org/irc/media.html](http://www.thepraxisproject.org/irc/media.html)
- Berkeley Media Studies Group: [http://www.bmsg.org](http://www.bmsg.org)
HIA Reporting Formats

Letters to proponents & decision-makers
Comment letters on draft EIAs
Formal report
Presentations
Peer-reviewed publications

Reporting strategies for Hawaii HIA
policy brief to accompany the Plan
individual and group briefings for County officials and other key stakeholders
press releases, local media (articles, radio shows, blogs)

HIA Reporting: Getting Feedback

Before HIA is “finalized”, develop a process to get feedback on findings. Consider:

Sharing your findings and proposed recommendations with the stakeholders you informed about your HIA
Getting input into how to prioritize the proposed recommendations
Posting the draft HIA report on a website before finalizing, and providing some mechanism for the public to get more information or provide feedback
Responding to specific public comments in some formal way

Communicating Findings: Examples

Humboldt County General Plan Update HIA
Newspaper articles
Press conference talking points
Presentations to community groups and Board of Supervisors

California Healthy Families, Healthy Workplaces Act (Paid Sick Days) HIA
Public testimony to legislative committees
TV, radio, and print media
Lobby visits with legislators and staff

Concord Naval Weapons Station Reuse Plan HIA
Meeting with redevelopment staff
Letters using HIA findings from county public health department

HIA Reporting: Communicating Findings

Frames help people make sense of what they hear and see by triggering concepts that already exist in their minds.

Developing a message frame:
What’s wrong?
Why does it matter?
What should be done?

What is the current frame around the Agricultural Plan?
Effective frames go beyond facts to communicate values

How could your issue be framed to include health?
Start with shared values:
What are the core values behind the change that you want to see?
How do these values help you define the problem?
Why would these values lead people to support your solution?

Communication Strategies: Paid Sick Days

Framing
“All Californians”
“Common sense”
“Disconnect between known best practices and current policies”

Summary of Findings
Public health spokespeople
Print, radio, TV, and online media

Communicating Findings

Consider the decision-makers that you are trying to influence with HIA findings.

What are some of the ways that you could effectively communicate your HIA findings to these and other stakeholders?

Exercise
Create a 1- to 2- sentence media headline for your HIA issue

Communicating with Key Stakeholders

Who are some of the key stakeholders (including decision-makers) who are not in the room?

What are some of the important messages about the recommendations in the Ag. Plan HIA that should be communicated to these stakeholders?
How will these messages be communicated?

What are some important questions for key stakeholders about how to effectively proceed with the HIA process? For example:
- best methods for communication opportunities for participation other questions or issues regarding HIA focus

Who will move forward with communication to various stakeholders

The HIA Process

- Screening
- Scoping
- Assessment
- Recommendations
- Reporting

Step 5: Monitoring

Objective
To track the impacts of the HIA on the decision-making process and the decision, the implementation of the decision, and the impacts of the decision on health determinants.

Task

Key points

Tools

Resources
STEP 5: MONITORING

Objective

To track the impacts of the HIA on the decision-making process and the decision, the implementation of the decision, and the impacts of the decision on health determinants.

Key Points

The purposes of monitoring are to:
- Ensure the project, plan, or policy is implemented as designed
- Establish accountability by tracking how recommendations were received and acted upon
- Track and support compliance with implementation agreements, rules, and standards
- Build a better understanding of the value of HIA and demonstrate how HIA influenced decision-making
- Provide early warning of unexpected consequences
- Test the validity and precision of health impact predictions

Monitoring decision impacts on health outcomes is challenging.

Data sources for monitoring include:
- Media reports about the HIA or the decision-making process
- Accounts from public agencies on changes
- Planning department reports on a project
- Interviews with decision-makers and stakeholders

Consider whether useful routine monitoring information is already being collected by agencies or organizations.

Essential elements of a monitoring plan, include:
- Goals
- Resources to conduct, complete, and report monitoring activities
- Identification of the outcomes, impacts and indicators to monitor
- Process for collection of meaningful and relevant information (baseline, long-term)
- Defined roles for individuals or organizations
- Criteria or triggers for action, if agreed-upon mitigations or recommendations are not met
- Process for reporting monitoring methods and results and making them publicly available
- Process for learning, adaptation, and response to monitoring results
- Commitment to monitoring to encourage policy makers and planners to be more conscious of health determinants.

Essential Tasks

- **Track** recommendation adoption, discussion of findings in the decision-making process, and how the decision-making climate for health considerations, and HIA institutionalization, changed as a result of the HIA.
- **Monitor decision implementation** to track whether the policy was carried out in accordance with HIA recommendations or if the project was built with HIA mitigations.
- **Monitor health determinants** and outcomes to evaluate HIA predictions.
Key Points (cont’d)

Indicators that could be monitored include health outcomes (consider latency and specificity), behaviors, health determinants, and compliance process measures.

Monitoring evaluates the impact of the HIA on the decision-making process and the results of the decision on health determinants. HIA Evaluation is focused on the HIA process.

Tools

Examples of monitoring questions

Did the HIA influence the project/policy decision?
- Did the HIA inform a discussion of the trade-offs involved with a project/policy?
- Did the final project/policy decision change in a way that was consistent with the recommendations of the HIA?
- Did the HIA aid in securing funds for project mitigations?

Outcomes of HIA on decision-making processes and institutional practices:
- Did the HIA help to build consensus and buy-in for policy decisions and implementation?
- Were HIA findings and recommendations useful or influential to policy-makers?
- Were discussions of connections between the decision and health evident in the media, statements by public officials or stakeholders, public testimony, public documents, or policy statements?
- Did the HIA lead to interest from previously uninvolved groups?
- Did the HIA encourage public health agencies to participate in new roles in policy and planning efforts?
- Have requests for the study of health impacts on additional projects, plans, or policies in the same jurisdiction followed?
- Are there new efforts to institutionalize HIA or other forms of health analysis of public policy?
- Did the HIA lead to greater institutional support for consideration of health in formal decision-making processes?
- Has the HIA led to the development of new partnerships and coalitions focused on ensuring that health is considered in decision-making? Are stakeholders who participated in the HIA continuing to work together on other health-related initiatives?

Resources

Examples of monitoring from other fields:
- National Ambient Air Quality Standards monitoring and planning under the Clean Air Act
- Mitigation monitoring under the California Environmental Quality Act
- Inspection procedures for compliance of building standards
- Notification requirements for compliance of labor laws

National Ambient Air Quality Standards monitoring and planning under the Clean Air Act
- Mitigation monitoring under the California Environmental Quality Act
- Inspection procedures for compliance of building standards
- Notification requirements for compliance of labor laws

Human Impact Partners · 274 14th Street Oakland, CA 94612 · 510.740.0143 · www.humanimpact.org
Examples of HIA Monitoring Questions

Did the HIA lead to changes in the design of the proposed project, plan, or policy?
- Did the project, plan, or policy change in a way that was consistent with recommendations?

Did the HIA lead to any changes in health determinants?
- Were negative health impacts prevented or positive health improvements observed because recommendations were implemented?

Monitoring – The Big Picture

Goal = To establish accountability. Recommendations are only the first step.
- How do we measure if we’re meeting our goals?
- How do we respond if we’re not achieving our goals?
- How do we hold decision-makers accountable?

Community organizations can’t do monitoring alone. Need to build relationships with collaborators to support this.

Monitoring Plan Elements

Develop a Monitoring Plan
- Goals
- Resources to conduct, complete, and report monitoring activities
- Identification of the outcomes, impacts and indicators to monitor
- Process for collection of meaningful and relevant information
- Defined roles for individuals or organizations
- Criteria or triggers for action, if agreed upon mitigations or recommendations are not met
- Process for reporting monitoring methods and results and making them publicly available
- Process for learning, adaptation, and response to monitoring results
- Commitment to monitoring to encourage policy makers and planners to be more conscious of health

Examples of HIA Monitoring Questions

See HIP’s HIA Monitoring Questions in your binder
Figure adapted from: “The adaptive management framework. Nyberg 1999, copyright Queen’s Printer for Ontario, 1999.”
## HIA Monitoring – Sample Questions

### Evaluation of HIA Impact on Decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the HIA influence the project, plan, or policy decision that was the subject of HIA?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA inform a discussion of the trade-offs involved with a project, plan, or policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the final project, plan or policy decision change in a way that was consistent with the recommendations of the HIA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA prevent project delays by anticipating stakeholder concerns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA aid in securing funds for project mitigations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes of HIA on decision-making processes and institutional practices

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA help to build consensus and buy-in for decisions and their implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Were HIA findings and recommendations useful or influential to policy-makers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Were discussions of connections between the decision and health evident in the media, statements by public officials or stakeholders, public testimony, public documents, or policy statements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA lead to interest from previously uninvolved groups (e.g., public health advocates), either in supporting or opposing the decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA encourage public health agencies to participate in new roles in policy and planning efforts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Since the HIA was conducted have there been requests for the study of health impacts on additional projects, plans, or policies in the same jurisdiction? Are there any new efforts to institutionalize HIA or other forms of health analysis of public policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA lead to support for development of policies that were not the subject of the HIA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did the HIA lead to greater institutional support for consideration of health in formal decision-making processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Are there efforts to institutionalize HIA or consideration of health criteria in policy and decision-making processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Has the HIA led to the development of new partnerships and coalitions focused on ensuring that health is considered in policy or decision-making processes? Are stakeholders who participated in the HIA continuing to work together on other health-related initiatives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample Monitoring Plan Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Plan Elements</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Indicator Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong>&lt;br&gt;State the plan, project or policy evaluated by the HIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>A County Comprehensive/General Plan Update: Safe and Sustainable Transportation Element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Process and outcome recommendations made to decision-makers - if prioritized, list in that order** | | Transportation indicators analyzed:  
- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)  
- Commute time  
- Trips made by public transit  
- Proportion of households within ¼-mile of bus  
- Proportion of income spent on transportation  
- Ratio of bike lanes and miles / pedestrian facilities to roads  
- Proportion of commute and school trips made by walking/biking  
- Pedestrian and bicycle injuries |
| **Decision-makers**<br>2-3 goals for the monitoring process | Board of Supervisors | 1. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies by large employers  
2. Increase public education about public transit  
3. Increase public transit options and frequency (e.g., bus, paratransit)  
4. Encourage retail, business, and industry to grow within urban boundaries  
5. Reduce speed limits on smaller roads  
6. Have a seat on HCOAG representing human-powered transport  
7. Prioritize non-motorized transportation in land use and construction plans  
8. Collect data about pedestrian and bike facilities |
| **Resources to conduct, complete, and report monitoring activities, including data collection** | | 1. Ten recommendations of 15 incorporated into Transportation Element  
2. At least 4 recommendations included in Area or Specific Plans  
3. Reduction in VMT (comparing 2007 to 2014) |
| **Define roles for individuals or organizations** | | • Ongoing data collection by Public Health Department epi staff  
• Ongoing data collection by Planning Dept staff  
• On-the-ground monitoring of built environment and policies by HumPAL and Healthy Humboldt |

Include which indicators each partner should monitor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Outcome:</th>
<th>Create tracking chart to note (for example, on a quarterly basis):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Overall, did the final plan change in  | • Whether decision was made
| a way that was consistent with the     | • Which recommendations were incorporated into the plan, project, or policy
| recommendations of the HIA?             | • Whether each accepted recommendation was implemented as agreed to |
| • Were recommendations                  | Assign responsibility for collecting this data to one partner organization |
| implemented after the decision?         |                                                                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Process:</th>
<th>Create tracking chart to note (on a bimonthly basis, for example) if findings were communicated via: mass media; public testimony; letters to stakeholders; other communications materials; or referencing of health evidence in public documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders use of HIA findings</td>
<td>Six months after HIA is completed, conduct phone interviews with pertinent participants and stakeholders to answer these and other questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did the HIA inform a discussion of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the trade-offs involved with a project/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were discussions of connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between the decision and health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evident?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did the HIA help to build consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and buy-in for policy decisions and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their implementation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did the HIA lead to interest from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previously uninvolved groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did the HIA encourage public health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies to participate in new roles in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy and planning efforts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Determinants:</th>
<th>Decide on priority indicators to track. For example, VMT, pedestrian injury, use of public transit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Which health determinants will be</td>
<td>Create a tracking chart to note (for example, on an annual basis):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessed?</td>
<td>• Whether any change in the determinant has been observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Direction of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation

Objective
To evaluate the process of conducting the HIA.

Tasks
Key points
Tools
Resources

Examples of HIA Evaluation Questions

- How were issues identified during scoping?
- Was the completed HIA consistent with the scope?
- What kinds of evidence were used in the HIA?
- What methods were used to communicate and translate findings? Were those methods effective?
- Were stakeholders meaningfully engaged in the HIA process?
- Was the HIA process transparent among partners and beyond?
- How many hours were spent on each step of the HIA and by whom?

See HIP's HIA Evaluation Questions in your binder
HIA EVALUATION

Objective
To evaluate the process of conducting the HIA.

Key Points
Be clear about the focus of the evaluation.
During HIA scoping consider how to build evaluation into the HIA process.
Meaningfully include stakeholders in planning the evaluation, including selecting the evaluation questions.

Essential Tasks
- Establish an evaluation plan.
- Delineate information that will be required for evaluation. Identify data sources and tools and methods for analysis.
- Ensure resources are available to conduct, complete and report evaluation results.
- Identify the individual or team that will be in charge of leading the evaluation. Assign responsibility for gathering data.
- Conduct the evaluation.
- Share evaluation results with others involved in the HIA.

Evaluation of the HIA process is an important way to develop and improve HIA methods, approaches and techniques, even though it is not included as one of the five steps of HIA. Evaluation can help:
- Provide feedback on successes and challenges, showing how HIA practice could be improved
- Assess whether the HIA met HIA practice standards
- HIA evaluation differs from HIA monitoring as monitoring is focused on outcomes of the decision that the HIA intended to influence, and the impacts of the decision’s implementation on health determinants and health outcomes

Ways to gather evaluation data include:
- Surveys:
  - Before/after focus group or other data collection process with HIA participants
  - Before/after HIA process with all stakeholders
- Key informant interviews with HIA partners/stakeholders
- Document review
- Meeting minutes and agendas
- Scoping worksheets and workplans
- Grant proposal narratives
- Email exchanges
Tools

Example Evaluation Questions

Screening
- Who was involved in screening the HIA and why? Were there others who should have been involved?
- What were the reasons for deciding to conduct the HIA?
- Were there arguments against conducting the HIA?

Scoping
- Who was involved in scoping? Were there others who would have been helpful to have participate in scoping?
- What methods were used to identify and prioritize health issues during scoping?
- Which health issues did the HIA address, which were left out, and how were those decisions made?

Assessment
- Did the HIA make judgments about positive and negative health effects of the decision under review?
- Did the HIA assess disproportionate harms or benefits to vulnerable populations?
- Was evidence used in the HIA supported by findings in the literature?
- Did the HIA document assumptions and limitations of the assessment?

Recommendations
- Did the HIA identify evidence-based health-promoting design solutions, mitigations, or alternatives? Did the HIA provide analysis of the effectiveness and feasibility of these recommendations?
- Did efforts to mitigate the potentially negative effects of the proposal focus on impacts of the largest magnitude?
- Were recommendations prioritized by the HIA steering committee? What process was used?

Reporting
- Did the HIA include comprehensive documentation of the process, analysis, and findings?
- Were stakeholders given an opportunity to review the findings and provide comment?
- How and when were recommendations delivered to the relevant decision-makers?
- Were stakeholders able to use HIA findings to develop or communicate their positions on policies/projects?

Monitoring
- Was a monitoring plan developed?

HIA Governance
- Was the HIA decision-making process transparent?
- How much time was spent on each phase of the HIA? What was the cost of conducting the HIA?
- What did those involved think about the process used?

Public Engagement
- What efforts were undertaken to involve affected populations in the process? How were these efforts successful?
- Do stakeholders feel that the HIA was responsive to their interests/concerns?
- Did the HIA utilize community experience as evidence?

Resources
# HIA Evaluation – Sample Questions

| **Screening** | ▪ Who was involved in screening the HIA and why? Were there others who should have been involved and why?  
▪ What were the reasons that the steering committee ultimately decided to conduct the HIA?  
▪ Were there arguments against conducting the HIA? What were some of the reasons why it may not have been beneficial to conduct a HIA? |
| **Scoping** | ▪ Who was involved in scoping? Were there others who would have been helpful to participate in scoping? Why?  
▪ Was the completed HIA consistent with the scoping plan?  
▪ What methods were used to identify and prioritize health issues during scoping? Were reasons for inclusion/exclusion documented?  
▪ Which health issues did the HIA address, which were left out, and how were those decisions made? |
| **Assessment** | ▪ Did the HIA make judgments about positive and negative health effects of the project, plan, or policy?  
▪ Did the HIA assess long-term effects or disproportionate harms or benefits to vulnerable populations?  
▪ Was evidence used in the HIA supported by findings in the literature?  
▪ Were the potential health impacts of project, plan, or policy alternatives explored in the HIA?  
▪ Did the HIA document methodology and data sources as well as assumptions and limitations of the assessment? |
| **Recommendations** | ▪ Did the HIA identify evidence-based health-promoting design solutions, mitigations, or alternatives? Did the HIA provide analysis of the effectiveness and feasibility of these recommendations?  
▪ Were efforts to mitigate potentially negative effects of the proposed project, plan, or policy concentrated on the impacts of the largest magnitude? If not, why?  
▪ Were recommendations prioritized by the HIA steering committee? If not, why? What process was used? |
| **HIA Steering Committee** | ▪ Was the HIA decision-making process transparent? How so? If not, what do you recommend to ensure transparency?  
▪ How much time was spent on the HIA? By whom (not just those who conducted HIA)?  
▪ What were the associated financial costs (e.g., salaries, travel, expenses)?  
▪ What did those involved think about the process and what changes would they make if they were to do it again?  
▪ To what extent was the goal of the HIA achieved? |
| Public Engagement | • What efforts were taken to involve affected populations in the HIA process? Were these efforts successful?  
• Do stakeholders feel that the HIA was responsive to their interests or concerns regarding the project, plan or policy?  
• Did the HIA utilize community knowledge and experience as evidence? In what ways? |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reporting        | • Did the HIA include comprehensive documentation of the HIA process, analysis, and findings?  
• Were stakeholders given an opportunity to review the findings and comment?  
• How and when were recommendations delivered to the relevant decision-makers?  
• Were stakeholders able to use HIA findings to develop or communicate their positions on policies/projects? |
| Monitoring       | • Was a monitoring plan developed? |
What is the role that training participants see themselves/ their organizations and agencies playing in the HIA process?
Health Impact Assessment Training
Evaluation Form - Day 2
June 24, 2010
Waimea, HI

Thank you for attending the HIA training presented by Human Impact Partners and The Kohala Center. Please take a moment to answer the questions below. Your comments and suggestions are very valuable to us.

Please rate the following statements listed below by circling the appropriate rating (1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neutral; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The content presented today deepened my understanding of the subject and HIA

2. I will use the knowledge/skills gained from today’s session in my future work

3. What did you particularly like or dislike about the content of today’s training?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Are there things that we should have covered today but did not?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. Are there things that we should have spent less time on today?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6. What are some of the specific things that you think you would need in order to begin HIA work at your agency/organization?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Please rate the different sections of the training on a scale of 1-5  

(1 = awful to 5 = excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Your Rating</th>
<th>Comments/Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. HIA Sticking Points</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recommendations and Mitigations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Considering How the HIA Can be Used to Influence the Ag. Plan</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reporting in HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communication with Key Stakeholders about the HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Monitoring in HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HIA Evaluation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Next Steps and Plan for Moving Forward with the HIA</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
________________________________________________________________________

15. On a scale of 1 to 10 (where 1=none and 10=expert) what was your level of knowledge of HIA prior to this training? (please circle one)
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

16. On a scale of 1 to 10 (where 1=none and 10=expert) what would you rate your level of knowledge about HIA now that you have participated in this training? (please circle one)
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

17. Did this training provide sufficient information and practice for you to start conducting HIA?
________________________________________________________________________
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I. Introduction

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) describes a systematic process used to make evidence-based judgments on the health impacts of public and private decisions and to identify and recommend strategies, including alternatives, design changes, and mitigation measures, to protect and promote health. With roots in the practice of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), HIA aims to inform the public and decision-makers when decisions about policies, programs, plans, and projects have the potential to significantly impact human health, and to advance values including democracy, equity, sustainable development, the ethical use of evidence and a comprehensive approach to health (International Association of Impact Assessment, 2006).

Although HIA is in use in a number of settings internationally, the practice is just emerging as a field in many parts of the world including the United States. While available guidance documents for HIA describe the typical procedural steps and products of each stage of the HIA process, there exists considerable diversity in the practices and products of HIA due to the variety of decisions assessed and practice settings, and the nascent evolution of the field.

Both for practice quality and for HIA development and institutionalization, HIAs should aim to adhere to some minimum standards of good practice. At present, there is a lack of specific standards or benchmarks to clearly distinguish HIA as a practice or to promote or establish HIA quality. Without practice standards, we believe the term HIA may become ambiguous and the practice may be misused or vulnerable to criticism.

This document is the collective product of HIA practitioners working in the North American context to translate the values underlying HIA and key lessons from conducting HIA into specific "standards for practice" for each of the five typical stages of the HIA process. The development of these standards was one of several objectives agreed upon by participants at the first North American Conference on Health Impact Assessment held in Oakland, California in September 2008. These standards may be used by practitioners as benchmarks for their own HIA practice or to stimulate discussion about HIA content and quality in this emerging field.

The members of the North American HIA Practice Standards Working Group do not claim to have achieved all of these standards in our work to date. We also recognize that real-world constraints and varying levels of capacity and experience will result in an appropriate and ongoing degree of diversity of HIA practice. Overall, we hope that these standards will be viewed as relevant, instructive and motivating for advancing HIA quality rather than rigorous criteria for acceptable or adequate HIA.
II. HIA of the Americas Convening Participants

September 24–26, 2008
Oakland, California, USA

Josi Auger  
Habitat Health Impact Consulting Corp.

Tania Barron  
Environmental Resources Management

Rajiv Bhatia  
San Francisco Department of Public Health

Brian Cole  
University of California at Los Angeles

Lili Farhang  
San Francisco Department of Public Health

Kim Gilhuly  
Alameda County Public Health Department

Ben Harris-Roxas  
UNSW Research Centre for Primary Health Care and Equity

Jonathan Heller  
Human Impact Partners

Nicole Iroz-Elardo  
Portland State University

Won Kim Cook  
Human Impact Partners

Murray Lee  
Habitat Health Impact Consulting

Jennifer Lucky  
Human Impact Partners

Colette Myrie  
Tropical Medicine Research Institute

Marla Orenstein  
Habitat Health Impact Consulting

Candace Rutt  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Edmund Seto  
University of California at Berkeley

Louise St-Pierre  
National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy

Ame-Lia Tamburrini  
Habitat Health Impact Consulting

Arthur Wendel  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Aaron Wernham  
Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium
## III. Proposed HIA Practice Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIA STAGE</th>
<th>PRACTICE STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>The HIA process should include at minimum the stages of <strong>screening</strong> to determine value and purpose; <strong>scoping</strong> to identify health issues and research methods; <strong>assessment</strong> of baseline conditions, impacts, alternatives and mitigations; and <strong>reporting</strong> of findings and recommendations. <strong>Monitoring</strong> is an important follow-up activity in the HIA process to track the outcomes of a decision and its implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Evaluation** of the HIA process and impacts is necessary for field development and practice improvement. Each HIA process should begin with explicit, written goals that can be evaluated as to their success at the end of the process.

- To the greatest extent feasible, HIA should be conducted in a manner that respects the needs and timing of the decision-making process it evaluates.

- Meaningful and inclusive stakeholder participation in each stage of the HIA supports HIA quality.

- Ideally, HIA is a prospective activity; however, the concurrent or retrospective application of HIA to decisions may be useful to demonstrate HIA utility in new contexts and to inform subsequent decision-making.

- When feasible, HIA should be part of an integrated impact assessment process (e.g., Environmental Impact Assessment) to avoid redundancy and to maximize the potential for inter-disciplinary analysis and health promoting mitigations or improvements, when applicable. While regulatory impact assessment processes may have specific procedural rules, HIA integrated within another impact assessment process should adhere to those procedural rules to the greatest extent feasible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Screening</strong></th>
<th>Screening should clearly identify all the decision alternatives under consideration by decision-makers at the time the HIA is conducted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screening should clearly identify how an HIA would add value to the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• After deciding to conduct an HIA, sponsors of the HIA should document the explicit goals of the HIA and should notify, to the extent feasible, decision-makers, identified stakeholders, affected individuals and organizations, and responsible public agencies.

• The sponsors for and funding of the HIA should be transparent.

**Scoping**

• Scoping of health issues and public concerns related to the decision should include identification of: 1) the decision and decision alternatives that will be studied; 2) potential significant health impacts and their pathways; 3) demographic, geographical and temporal boundaries for impact analysis; 4) research (e.g., data, methods, and tools) expected to be used for impacts analysis; 5) gaps in the data available for the HIA, and potential studies or other methods to ensure adequate data; 6) roles for experts and key informants; 7) the standards or process, if any, that will be used for determining the significance of health impacts; 8) a plan for external and public review; and 9) a plan for dissemination of findings and recommendations.

• Scoping should include consideration of all potential pathways that could reasonably link the decision and/or proposed activity to health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative, as opposed to limiting consideration only to those impacts that are of interest to the researcher, project proponent or community. The final scope should necessarily focus on those impacts with the greatest likelihood of occurrence and significance and those that are the subject of the greatest public concern.

• The scope should include data and methods to reveal inequities in conditions or impacts based on population characteristics, including but not limited to age, gender, income, place (disadvantaged locations), and ethnicity.

• Community stakeholders, decision-makers, and other individuals and organizations knowledgeable about and responsible for the health of a community (e.g., public health agencies, health care providers, local government) should have an opportunity to identify and prioritize potential health impacts and contribute to or critique the scope of the HIA. Hosting a public meeting to receive feedback during the scoping process, receiving public comments on the scoping findings, interviewing stakeholders and experts, or inviting local health officials to participate in
the scoping process are all potential means of soliciting such input. HIA practitioners should consider and apply diverse outreach methods to gain input from different stakeholder populations.

- The scoping process should establish the individual or team responsible for conducting the HIA. Participation by municipal, state, and tribal health officials should be encouraged, to ensure adequate representation by the entities responsible for and knowledgeable about local health conditions.

- The HIA scoping process should incorporate new, relevant information and evidence as it becomes available, including through expert or stakeholder feedback.

**Assessment**

- Assessment should include at minimum: 1) a profile of baseline conditions (e.g., baseline health status and factors known or suspected to influence health); 2) an evaluation of potential health impacts (e.g., qualitative and/or quantitative analyses) including a qualitative or quantitative judgment of their certainty and significance and evaluation of any inequitable impacts; and 3) management strategies for any identified adverse health impacts – in the form of decision alternatives, mitigation of specific impacts, or other related policy recommendations.

- Documentation of baseline conditions should include documentation of both population health vulnerabilities (based on the population characteristics described above) and inequalities in health outcomes among subpopulations or places.

- HIA findings and conclusions should rely on the best available evidence. This means:
  - Evidence considered may include existing data, empirical research, professional expertise and local knowledge, and the products of original investigations.
  - When available, practitioners should utilize evidence from well-designed and peer-reviewed systematic reviews.
  - When available, HIA practitioners should consider published evidence, both supporting and refuting particular health impacts.
  - The expertise and experience of affected members of the public (local knowledge), whether obtained via the use of participatory methods, collected via formal qualitative research methods, or reflected in public testimony, is potential evidence.
  - Justification for the selection or exclusion of particular methodologies and data sources should be made explicit (e.g., resource constraints).
  - The HIA should identify data gaps that prevent an adequate or
An HIA should acknowledge limitations of data and methods.
  - Assessors should describe the uncertainty in predictions.
  - Assumptions or inferences made in the context of predictions should be made explicit.
  - Affected members of the public should have the opportunity to comment on the validity of evidence and findings.
  - The HIA should acknowledge when available methods were not utilized and why (e.g., resource constraints).

The lack of formal, scientific, quantitative or published evidence should not preclude reasoned predictions of health impacts.

The assessment of significance of impacts or the establishment of thresholds of significance, when applicable, should reflect evidence as well as community values, and should occur through a transparent, inclusive, and documented public process.

The HIA should include specific recommendations to address the health impacts identified, including decision alternatives, modifications to the proposed policy, program, or project, or mitigation measures.

HIA practitioners should seek expert guidance regarding potential decision or design alternatives and mitigations to ensure they reflect current available and effective practices.

Recommendations should account for uncertainty in HIA predictions through providing suggestions for monitoring, reassessment, and potential future measures to mitigate any identified effects (e.g., adaptive management).

**Reporting**

- The responsible parties should complete a report of the HIA findings and recommendations.
- To support effective, inclusive communication of the principle HIA findings and recommendations, a succinct summary should be created that communicates findings at a level that allows all stakeholders to understand, evaluate, and respond to the findings.
- The full HIA report should document the screening and scoping process and identify all the participants in the HIA and their contributions.
- The full HIA report should, for each specific health issue analyzed, discuss the available scientific evidence, describe the data sources and
analytic methods used for the HIA including their rationale, profile existing conditions, detail the analytic results, characterize the health impacts and their significance, and list corresponding recommendations for policy, program, or project alternatives, design or mitigations.

- Recommendations for decision alternatives, policy recommendations, or mitigations should be specific and justified. The criteria used for prioritization of recommendations should be explicitly stated and based on scientific evidence and, ideally, informed by an inclusive process that accounts for stakeholder values.

- The HIA reporting process should offer stakeholders and decision-makers a meaningful opportunity to critically review evidence, methods, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Ideally, a draft report should be made available and readily accessible for public review and comment. The HIA practitioners should address substantive criticisms either through a formal written response or HIA report revisions before finalizing the HIA report.

- The final HIA report should be made publicly accessible.

**Monitoring**

- Monitoring impacts of an HIA on decision-making and impacts of the decision on health determinants and outcomes is encouraged to the greatest extent feasible.

- A monitoring plan for an HIA, if created and implemented, should include: 1) goals for long-term monitoring; 2) outcomes and indicators for monitoring; 3) lead individuals or organizations to conduct monitoring; 4) a mechanism to report monitoring outcomes to decision-makers and HIA stakeholders; and 5) resources to conduct, complete, and report the monitoring.

- Methods and results from monitoring should be made available to the public.
IV. Guiding Principles for HIA


Democracy – emphasizing the right of people to participate in the formulation and decisions of proposals that affect their life, both directly and through elected decision makers. In adhering to this value, the HIA method should involve and engage the public, and inform and influence decision makers. A distinction should be made between those who take risks voluntarily and those who are exposed to risks involuntarily (World Health Organization, 2001).

Equity – emphasizing the desire to reduce inequity that results from avoidable differences in the health determinants and/or health status within and between different population groups. In adhering to this value, HIA should consider the distribution of health impacts across populations, paying specific attention to vulnerable groups and recommend ways to improve the proposed development for affected groups.

Sustainable development – emphasizing that development meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. In adhering to this value, the HIA method should judge short- and long-term impacts of a proposal and provide those judgments within a time frame to inform decision makers. Good health is the basis of resilience in the human communities that support development.

Ethical use of evidence – emphasizing that transparent and rigorous processes are used to synthesize and interpret the evidence, that the best available evidence from different disciplines and methodologies is utilized, that all evidence is valued, and that recommendations are developed impartially. In adhering to this value, the HIA method should use evidence to judge impacts and inform recommendations; it should not set out to support or refute any proposal, and it should be rigorous and transparent.

Comprehensive approach to health – emphasizing that physical, mental and social well-being is determined by a broad range of factors from all sectors of society (known as the wider determinants of health). In adhering to this value, the HIA method should be guided by the wider determinants of health.
HIA Web Resources

- Human Impact Partners HIA Toolkit – www.humanimpact.org
- Health Impact Project – www.healthimpactproject.org
- San Francisco Bay Area Health Impact Assessment Collaborative - http://www.hiacollaborative.org/
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention – http://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/hia.htm
- San Francisco Department of Public Health, Program on Health, Equity and Sustainability – www.sfphes.org
- The Healthy Development Measurement Tool – www.thehdmt.org
- University of California, Los Angeles, HIA Clearinghouse Learning and Information Center (HIA-CLIC) – http://www.ph.ucla.edu/hs/hiaclic/archive.htm
- University of California, Berkeley, Health Impact Group and Health Impact Assessment Course – http://ehs.sph.berkeley.edu/hia
- National Association of City and County Health Officials, Community Design/Land Use Planning – http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/landuseplanning/index.cfm

See also “Health Impact Assessment Data Sources for Baseline Profiles of Health” on HIP’s website: http://www.humanimpact.org/HIP_HIA_DataSources.pdf