

July 10, 2015

Honorable Members, Los Angeles City Council
Honorable Members, City Planning Commission
Mr. Michael LoGrande, Director, Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring St., Fifth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: CF 11-0112 and CPC

Honorable Councilmembers, Commissioners and Director:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this comment letter regarding the proposed Clean Up Green Up initiative. We are particularly encouraged by and supportive of the proposed Health Impact Assessment (HIA) requirement, and are writing to provide information and resources to support its continued inclusion in the overall ordinance.

Human Impact Partners is a national non-profit – based in Oakland, CA – working to transform policies and places in ways that improve health, equity, and wellbeing. People need to live healthy lives and it is important for the public sector to take the lead in increasing opportunities for healthy living and considering health and equity in their decision making. We have been a leader in the field of HIA since its inception, and no other organization has our depth of experience and knowledge with HIA. Since our founding in 2006, HIP has accomplished the following (among many other activities):

- Completed over 20 high-quality and well-regarded Health Impact Assessments, on housing, land use, transportation and other built environment topics.
- Provided targeted mentoring and technical assistance to organizations and agencies across the country on over 30 HIAs.
- Conducted over 50 HIA trainings for over 1500 people.
- Provided both formal and informal support for public health practitioners interested in focusing on the social determinants of health, community engagement, and equity.

To date, over 300 HIAs have been completed or are in process around the country – many of these conducted by government agencies including health departments, planning departments, and MPOs. There exists considerable diversity in the practice and in the products of HIA due to the variety of policies, plans, programs, and projects assessed; the diverse settings in which decisions take place; and the evolution of the field. Fundamentally, however, the purpose of HIA is to assess the health impacts of proposed projects and plans – including cumulative health impacts in communities experiencing disproportionate health hazards – and identify ways to mitigate any potential harms identified. In addition, engagement of community members throughout an HIA is a core part of the HIA process.

As written in the proposed Clean Up Green Up ordinance, the HIA requirement is in line with this purpose and is properly targeted to the type of projects that may benefit from HIA-type review. There are a number of available guidance documents for HIA that describe the

procedural steps and outputs of the HIA process, and that can support potential project sponsors who would be required to conduct an HIA. The *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards for Health Impact Assessment* (attached for your review) provide guidance on what is required for a study to be considered an HIA and benchmarks for effective practice. We highlight here several of minimum elements that reflect the intent of the CUGU initiative:

- *Minimum Element 3*: HIA systematically considers the full range of potential impacts of the proposal on health determinants, health status, and health equity.
- *Minimum Element 6*: HIA provides recommendations, as needed, on feasible and effective actions to promote the positive health impacts and mitigate the negative health impacts of the decision, identifying, where appropriate, alternatives or modifications to the proposal.
- *Minimum Element 8*: HIA proposes indicators, actions, and responsible parties, where indicated, for a plan to monitor the implementation of recommendations, as well as health effects and outcomes of the proposal.

Our organization was one of the primary authors of this document, and has significant experience in applying the standards in HIA practice. In addition, the National Academy of Sciences published *Improving Health in the United States: The Role of Health Impact Assessment*, which describes the background of HIA, steps in the process, and offers guidance to officials in the public and private sectors on conducting HIAs.

While we endorse providing a regulatory framework under which HIA would be conducted, most HIAs are done outside of any formal legal or regulatory requirement, and the vast majority has been conducted voluntarily to great success. A recently completed legal review of HIAs concerning the use of HIAs found that, “*Even in the absence of explicit legal authority to conduct HIAs, government agencies and officials increasingly conduct HIAs or consider the results of HIAs conducted by other organizations to inform their decisions. This has been the most common method of HIA practice in the United States.*” Requirements for HIA can be found in Washington for several types of energy and environment proposals and Massachusetts for several types of transportation proposals.

However, numerous laws across the country *facilitate* the conduct of HIAs by authorizing or requiring the functional equivalent of an HIA to inform programmatic, policy, or administrative decisions. Furthermore, HIAs – when applied in domains that require environmental review – often cover material not regularly assessed in an EIR which complements and expands the base of information considered to facilitate sound decision making.

Given this context, the requirement to conduct an HIA as part of the Conditional Use process is appropriate and would contribute to an expansion of the field by normalizing the collection, evaluation and dissemination of public health data and considering public health implications in the land use approval process.

Attached is a full list of HIAs that our organization has conducted. In addition to Human Impact Partners, other technical HIA provider organizations include (but are not limited to): Upstream Public Health, Oregon Public Health Institute, Habitat Health Impact Consulting, Raimi + Associates, EnviroHealth Consulting, Georgia Health Policy Center, and Environmental

Resources Management. We are happy to provide you with a list of consultants should you be interested.


We applaud the Planning Department, City Planning Commission, and City Council in their foresight to consider the role of HIAs in permitting certain types of projects that are known to affect health and wellbeing, and we are happy to answer any questions you may have. Again, thank you for the opportunity to submit this letter of support.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lili Farhang".

Lili Farhang
Co-Director
Human Impact Partners

Cc: Hagu Solomon-Cary, Department of City Planning



Minimum Elements
and
Practice Standards
for
Health Impact Assessment

Version 3
September 2014

Authorship

This document represents a revision of the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards for Health Impact Assessment*, originally published by the North American HIA Practice Standards Working Group in April 2009 and revised in November, 2010.

This review and revision was conducted by a working group comprised of the following individuals: Rajiv Bhatia,¹ Lili Farhang,² Jonathan Heller,² Murray Lee,³ Marla Orenstein,³ Maxwell Richardson,⁴ and Aaron Wernham.⁵ In producing this document, the working group solicited review and comment from both HIA practitioners and any other parties who were interested in providing feedback.

¹ *The Civic Engine - San Francisco, California, USA*

² *Human Impact Partners - Oakland, California, USA*

³ *Habitat Health Impact Consulting - Calgary, Alberta, Canada*

⁴ *Public Health Institute - Oakland, California, USA (affiliation for identification purposes only)*

⁵ *Health Impact Project - Washington, DC, USA*

Suggested Citation

Bhatia R, Farhang L, Heller J, Lee M, Orenstein M, Richardson M and Wernham A. Minimum Elements and Practice Standards for Health Impact Assessment, Version 3. September, 2014.

Purpose and Scope of this document

What is Health Impact Assessment?

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a practice that aims to protect and promote health and to reduce inequities in health during a decision-making process. The International Association of Impact Assessment defines HIA as: ***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.*** With roots in the practice of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), HIA aims to inform the public and decision-makers when decisions about policies, plans, programs, and projects have the potential to significantly impact human health.

There exists considerable diversity in the practice and products of HIA due to the variety of policies, plans, programs, and projects assessed; the diverse settings in which decisions take place; and the evolution of the field. A number of available guidance documents for HIA describe the procedural steps and outputs of the HIA process. This document, in contrast, is intended to provide guidance on what is required for a study to be considered an HIA (Minimum Elements) and some benchmarks for effective practice (Practice Standards).

These standards are aligned with the central concepts and suggested approaches described in the World Health Organization's 1999 *Gothenburg Consensus Paper on HIA*, which first laid out the values that underpin HIA: democracy, equity, sustainable development, the ethical use of evidence, and a comprehensive approach to health.

Overall, we hope that these standards, now in their third iteration, will be viewed as relevant, instructive, and motivating for advancing HIA quality.

What are *Minimum Elements*?

In this document, Minimum Elements answer the question of “what essential elements constitute an HIA?”. Minimum Elements distinguish HIA from other practices and methods that also aim to ensure the consideration of and action on health interests in public policy.

These Minimum Elements apply to HIA whether conducted independently or integrated within an environmental, social or strategic impact assessment.

What are *Practice Standards*?

Practice Standards answer the question “how should an HIA best be conducted?”. A practitioner may use the Practice Standards as benchmarks for their own HIA practice and to stimulate discussion about HIA content and quality.

How Should the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* Be Used?

The *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* can serve HIA practitioners as well as those who request, fund, and evaluate HIA practice, for example:

- a practitioner may use the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* as a benchmark to plan, implement, or evaluate an individual HIA;
- educators may use the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* to organize trainings and stimulate dialogue regarding the practice of HIA;
- funders or regulators may use or adapt the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* to create standards for HIA practice or to screen HIA proposals;
- evaluators of the field of HIA may use the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* to identify HIAs (*i.e.*, to distinguish them from other practices) and to examine how various practice benchmarks relate to the effectiveness of the HIA process;
- policy-makers may use the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* in designing institutional or regulatory requirements, supports, or incentives for HIA.

Caveats and Cautions

The *Practice Standards* are not rigid criteria for acceptability but represent the authors’ perspective on best practices. Each HIA will vary along a continuum to meet the requirements of the scope, timeline, decision context, available resources, and expertise. Real-world constraints and varying levels of capacity and experience will result in appropriate and ongoing diversity of HIA practice. Every practice standard in this document may not be achievable in every HIA.

Many of the *Practice Standards* describe aspects of HIA process that are not always apparent in the final HIA product (e.g., an HIA report). Evaluation of an individual HIA or the field of practice using the *Minimum Elements and Practice Standards* should recognize that published HIA reports might not include documentation sufficient to gauge the performance of HIAs against these standards. Any evaluation of HIAs against these standards should therefore incorporate discussion with HIA authors in order to fully understand the extent to which the standards have been achieved.

Minimum Elements of HIA

Comprehensive Health Impact Assessments (HIA) should include the following minimum elements, which together distinguish HIA from other processes used to assess and inform decisions:

1. HIA is conducted to assess the potential health consequences of a proposed program, policy, project, or plan under consideration by decision-makers, and is conducted in advance of the decision in question.
2. HIA involves and engages stakeholders affected by the proposal, particularly vulnerable populations.
3. HIA systematically considers the full range of potential impacts of the proposal on health determinants, health status, and health equity.
4. HIA provides a profile of existing conditions for the populations affected by the proposal, including their health outcomes, health determinants, and vulnerable sub-groups within the population, relevant to the health issues examined in the HIA.
5. HIA characterizes the proposal's impacts on health, health determinants, and health equity, while documenting data sources and analytic methods, quality of evidence used, methodological assumptions, and limitations.
6. HIA provides recommendations, as needed, on feasible and effective actions to promote the positive health impacts and mitigate the negative health impacts of the decision, identifying, where appropriate, alternatives or modifications to the proposal.
7. HIA produces a publicly accessible report that includes, at minimum, documentation of the HIA's purpose, findings, and recommendations, and either documentation of the processes and methods involved, or reference to an external source of documentation for these processes and methods. The report should be shared with decision-makers and other stakeholders.
8. HIA proposes indicators, actions, and responsible parties, where indicated, for a plan to monitor the implementation of recommendations, as well as health effects and outcomes of the proposal.

Practice Standards

Adherence to the following standards is recommended to advance effective HIA practice:

1. GENERAL STANDARDS FOR THE HIA PROCESS

- 1.1 HIA is a forward-looking activity intended to inform a proposed program, policy, project, or plan under consideration by decision-makers; however, an HIA may evaluate an existing program, policy, project, or plan in order to inform a prospective decision or discussion.
- 1.2 An HIA should include the steps of screening, scoping, assessment, recommendations, reporting, and evaluation.
- 1.3 Each HIA process should begin with explicit written goals that can be used to evaluate the success and impacts of an HIA process.
- 1.4 The HIA should be responsive to the needs and timing of the decision-making process.
- 1.5 HIA requires integration of knowledge from many disciplines as well as from affected communities. The practitioner or practitioner team must take reasonable steps to identify, solicit, and utilize this expertise to both identify and answer questions about potentially significant health impacts.
- 1.6 Meaningful and inclusive stakeholder (e.g., affected community, public agency, decision-maker) participation in each step of the HIA supports HIA quality and effectiveness. Each HIA should have a specific engagement and participation approach that utilizes participatory or deliberative methods suitable to the needs of stakeholders and context.
- 1.7 Monitoring is an important follow-up activity in the HIA process. The HIA should propose a monitoring plan to track the health-related outcomes of a decision and its implementation.
- 1.8 HIA integrated within another impact assessment process should adhere to these practice standards to the greatest extent possible.

2. STANDARDS FOR THE SCREENING STEP

While screening may be part of a linear HIA process, it may also occur apart from and prior to an HIA, without negative effects on practice quality. The impetus or decision to conduct an HIA may result from forces including political decisions or regulatory requirements and may be conducted by individuals or organizations other than HIA practitioners. Because of these alternative drivers for HIA, a process for screening is not considered an essential element.

- 2.1 Screening should clearly identify all the decision alternatives under consideration by decision-makers at the time the HIA is considered.
- 2.2 Screening should determine whether an HIA would add value to the decision-making process. The following factors may be among those weighed in the screening process:
 - a) the potential for the decision to result in substantial effects on public health, particularly those effects which are avoidable, involuntary, adverse, irreversible, or catastrophic;
 - b) the potential for unequally distributed impacts;
 - c) the potential for impacts on populations with poor health;
 - d) stakeholder concerns about a decision's health effects;
 - e) the potential for the HIA to add new information that would be useful to decision-makers;
 - f) the potential for the HIA to result in timely changes to a policy, plan, program, or project;
 - g) the availability of data, methods, resources, and technical capacity to conduct analyses;
 - h) the availability, application, and effectiveness of alternative opportunities or approaches to evaluate and communicate the decision's potential health impacts.
- 2.3 Sponsors of the HIA should notify, to the extent feasible, decision-makers, stakeholders, affected individuals and organizations, and responsible public agencies on their decision to conduct an HIA.

3. STANDARDS FOR THE SCOPING STEP

- 3.1 The scoping process should establish the individual or team responsible for conducting the HIA and should define roles for the HIA team, funders, technical advisors, stakeholders, and other partners.
- 3.2 During scoping, the goals and anticipated outcomes of the HIA should be clearly established and documented.
- 3.3 A plan for conducting the HIA should be established that includes identification of:
 - a) the decision and decision alternatives that will be studied;
 - b) potential significant health and health equity impacts that will be studied;
 - c) demographic, geographical, and temporal boundaries for impact analysis;

- d) research questions for impact analysis;
 - e) evidence sources and research methods expected for each research question in impact analysis;
 - f) an approach to the evaluation and characterization of impacts and their distribution;
 - g) roles for experts and key informants;
 - h) the standards or process, if any, that will be used for determining the significance of health impacts;
 - i) a plan for external and public review; and
 - j) a plan for disseminating findings and recommendations.
- 3.4 A stakeholder engagement plan should be developed that establishes not only which stakeholders should be invited to participate in the process, but also the level of engagement to be solicited, and the methods that will be utilized to promote stakeholder participation throughout the HIA process.
- 3.5 During scoping, the range of health issues to be examined in the HIA should be clearly defined.
- 3.5.1 Scoping should include a systematic consideration of potential pathways that could reasonably link the decision and/or proposed activity to health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative.
 - 3.5.2 Scoping should consider both individual health outcomes and contextual health determinants.
 - 3.5.3 The final scope should focus on those impacts with the greatest potential significance, with regards to factors including but not limited to magnitude, severity, certainty, stakeholder priorities, and equity.
 - 3.5.4 In identifying and evaluating priority health issues, practitioners should consider the expertise of health professionals, the experience of the affected communities, and the information needs of decision-makers.
- 3.6 The scope should include an approach to evaluate any potential inequities in impacts based on population characteristics, including but not limited to age, gender, income, place (disadvantaged locations), and race or ethnicity.

4. STANDARDS FOR THE ASSESSMENT STEP

- 4.1 Assessment should include, at a minimum, a summary of existing (baseline) conditions and a assessment of health impacts.
- 4.2 Existing conditions should present a profile of relevant health status and health determinants among the affected communities. The existing conditions should also document known

population health vulnerabilities including evidence of poor health status among affected communities.

4.3 Assessment of health impacts should be based on a synthesis of the best available evidence. This means:

4.3.1 Evidence considered may include existing data, empirical research, professional expertise and local knowledge, and the products of original investigations.

4.3.2 When available, practitioners should utilize evidence from well-designed and peer-reviewed systematic reviews.

4.3.3 HIA practitioners should consider evidence both supporting and refuting particular health impacts.

4.3.4 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, comprise a legitimate source of evidence.

4.3.5 In summarizing the quality of evidence for each pathway, the HIA should rate the strength of evidence based on best practices for the relevant field (i.e., standards for meta-analysis, epidemiologic studies, qualitative methods, or others as appropriate).

4.3.6 Practitioners should acknowledge where evidence is insufficient to evaluate or judge health effects identified as priority issues in the screening and scoping stage of HIA.

4.4 To support determinations of impact significance, the HIA should characterize health impacts using parameters such as (but not limited to) direction, severity, magnitude, likelihood, and distribution within the population. These can be understood as follows:

Direction: Whether the potential change would be beneficial or adverse

Severity: More severe effects include those that are disabling, life-threatening, and permanent

Magnitude: How widely the effects would be spread within a population or across a geographical area

Likelihood: How likely it is that a given exposure or effect will occur.

4.5 Assessment of health impacts should explicitly acknowledge methodological assumptions as well as the strengths and limitations of all data and methods used.

4.5.1 The HIA should identify data gaps that prevent an adequate or complete assessment of potential impacts.

4.5.2 Assessors should describe the uncertainty in predictions.

- 4.5.3 Assumptions or inferences made in the context of modeling or predictions should be made explicit.
- 4.5.4 Justification for the selection or exclusion of particular methodologies and data sources should be made explicit (e.g., resource constraints).
- 4.5.5 The HIA should acknowledge when available methods were not utilized and why (e.g., resource constraints).
- 4.6 The lack of formal, scientific, quantitative, or published evidence should not preclude reasoned evaluation of health impacts.

5. STANDARDS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS STEP

- 5.1 The HIA should include specific recommendations to manage the health and equity impacts identified, including recommendations supporting a specific decision alternative; modifications to the proposed policy, program, plan, or project; or mitigation/enhancement measures.
- 5.2 Recommendations should consider not only the mitigation of adverse effects, but also the potential to enhance health benefits.
- 5.3 Recommendations may not be indicated in all cases: for example, if there are no identified adverse impacts or if an HIA practitioner is not legally able to take a policy position.
- 5.4 The following criteria may be considered in developing recommendations and mitigation measures: responsiveness to predicted impacts, specificity, technical feasibility, enforceability, and authority of decision-makers.
- 5.5 Input from the affected population(s) should be solicited and considered during development of recommendations to ensure that the recommendations are responsive to community needs and address community concerns in an acceptable manner.
- 5.6 The criteria used for any prioritization of recommendations should be explicitly documented.
- 5.7 Recommendations are effective only if they are adopted and implemented; therefore, input should be solicited from decision-makers on the developed recommendations and considered to ensure that the recommendations can be translated into actionable measures.
- 5.8 Where needed, expert guidance should be utilized to ensure recommendations reflect current effective practices.
- 5.9 Where possible, recommended mitigations should be further developed and integrated into a Health Management Plan that clearly outlines how each mitigation measure will be implemented. Management plans commonly include information on: deadlines, responsibilities, management

structure, potential partnerships, engagement activities, and monitoring related to the implementation of the HIA mitigations.

- 5.10 An HIA may include recommendations that go beyond the purview of the proposal decision-maker and that target different audiences such as project investors or financiers, implementing agencies, regulating agencies, health care agencies, or researchers.

6. STANDARDS FOR THE REPORTING STEP

- 6.1 The parties conducting the HIA should provide a publicly accessible final report that includes, at minimum, the HIA's purpose, findings, and recommendations. The report should also document the process involved in arriving at findings and recommendations (e.g., assessment methodology and recommendation setting approach) or alternatively provide separate documentation of these processes.
- 6.2 To support effective, inclusive communication of the principal HIA findings and recommendations, a succinct summary should be created that communicates findings in a way that allows all stakeholders to understand, evaluate, and respond to the findings.
- 6.3 The full HIA report should document the screening and scoping processes and identify the sponsor of the HIA and the funding source, the team conducting the HIA, and all other participants in the HIA and their roles and contributions. Any potential conflicts of interest should be acknowledged.
- 6.4 The full HIA report should, for each specific health issue analyzed:
- a) discuss the available scientific evidence;
 - b) describe the data sources and analytic methods used for the HIA including their rationale;
 - c) profile existing conditions;
 - d) detail the analytic results;
 - e) characterize the health impacts and their significance;
 - f) list corresponding recommendations for policy, program, plan, or project alternatives, design, or mitigations; and
 - g) describe the limitations of the HIA.
- 6.5 The HIA reporting process should offer stakeholders and decision-makers a meaningful opportunity to critically review evidence, methods, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The HIA practitioners should address substantive criticisms.
- 6.6 The HIA report should be made available and readily accessible in a format that is accessible to all stakeholders, taking into consideration factors such as education, language, and digital access.

7. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

Evaluation of the HIA process, impacts, and outcomes is necessary for field development and practice improvement. While evaluation thus plays an important role, it is not an essential element of HIA and in practice is often not conducted. When evaluation is conducted, the following should be considered:

- 7.1 The HIA may be evaluated in terms of process. *Process evaluation* attempts to determine the effectiveness of how the HIA was designed and undertaken, including preparation, research, reporting, participation, and follow-up. Process evaluation may be conducted either after the completion of the HIA, or during the course of the HIA to facilitate adaptations that will improve HIA process.
- 7.2 The HIA may also be evaluated in terms of its impact. *Impact evaluation* seeks to understand the impact of the HIA itself on the decision and the decision-making process. Impact evaluation assesses the extent to which the HIA influenced various stakeholders and the extent to which the HIA recommendations were accepted and implemented.

8. STANDARDS FOR MONITORING

Monitoring (sometimes termed *outcome evaluation*) tracks the effect of the proposed policy, project, or program on health outcomes and/or determinants of concern.

Monitoring the implementation and outcomes of a decision is properly the responsibility of the project proponent or an authorizing, funding, or implementing public agency. Comprehensive monitoring is not the responsibility of, and usually not within the capacity of, HIA practitioners. Nonetheless, the HIA should, where possible, propose a monitoring plan.

- 8.1 The monitoring plan should include:
 - a) goals for short- and long-term monitoring;
 - b) indicators for monitoring;
 - c) triggers or thresholds that may lead to review and adaptation in decision implementation;
 - d) the identification of resources required to conduct, complete, and report the monitoring;
and
 - e) a mechanism to report monitoring outcomes to decision-makers and stakeholders.
- 8.2 When monitoring is conducted, methods and results from monitoring should be made available to the public, including the affected community, in a timely fashion.

Key References

This document is not intended to comprise a guidebook on how to conduct HIA, but rather a guidance document on what elements are essential or desirable to include. Many useful guides and toolkits exist that can help practitioners with operationalizing HIA and with following best practices in doing so. Some key references that will help HIA practitioners and those wishing to better understand HIA are listed below.

Ross C, Orenstein M, Botchwey N. **Health Impact Assessment in the United States** (textbook) (2014). New York: Springer Publishers. Available through Amazon.com.

National Research Council. **Improving Health in the United States: the Role of Health Impact Assessment** (2011). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Available at: http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13229.

Guidance and Best Practices for Stakeholder Participation in Health Impact Assessments - Version 1.0 (2012). Prepared by the Stakeholder Participation Working Group of the 2010 HIA of the Americas Workshop. Available at: <http://www.hiasociety.org/documents/guide-for-stakeholder-participation.pdf>.

Equity Metrics for Health Impact Assessment Practice, Version 1 (2014). Prepared by Benkhalti Jandu M, Bourcier E, Choi T, Gould S, Given M, Heller J, Yuen T. Available at: http://www.hiasociety.org/documents/EquityMetrics_FINAL.pdf.

Society for Practitioners of HIA (SOPHIA) website. <http://hiasociety.org/>



Completed HIA Projects

The following is a list of HIA projects completed by Human Impact Partners. For information on any of these projects, contact info@humanimpact.org.

crimin

Project (year completed)	Description	Organizational Partners/Clients	Downloads
Criminal Justice			
Treatment Instead of Prison (2012)	<i>An HIA examining an increase in funding for treatment alternatives in Wisconsin.</i>	WISDOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Story
Prop 47 Sentencing Reform (2014)	<i>An HIA of a statewide ballot initiative in California that reclassifies low-level non-violent crimes to misdemeanors and redirects funding to treatment and prevention.</i>	16 member advisory board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary • Research Summary • HIA Full Report • Technical Report • Press Release • Website report and infographic • Factsheet
Tuition Assistance Policy for People in Prison (2015)	<i>An HIA on a bill to reinstate tuition assistance for people in prison in New York State.</i>	Education from the Inside Out Coalition (EIOC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary • Full Report • Appendices • Website
Land Use			
Concord Naval Weapons Station (2008)	<i>An HIA of a proposed land use development plan in Concord,</i>	East Bay Housing Organizations (EBHO), Contra Costa Interfaith Supporting Community Organization (CCISCO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief Project Summary • Final report • Appendices

	CA		
East Bay Greenway (2007)	<i>An HIA of a proposed greenway/park project in Alameda County, CA</i>	Urban Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Scoping worksheet • Brief project summary
Farmers Field (2012)	<i>An HIA of a proposed stadium development project in downtown Los Angeles, CA</i>	Los Angeles Community Action Network (LA CAN), Los Angeles Legal Aid Foundation (LAFLA), Physicians for Social Responsibility – LA (PSR-LA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers Field Case Story • Brief project summary
Humboldt General Plan Update (2008)	<i>An HIA of a General Plan Update in Humboldt County, CA</i>	Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services, Humboldt Partnership for Active Living (HumpAL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary • Humboldt Final Report • Brief project summary • Case study
Lake Merritt Bart Station Specific Plan (2012)	<i>An HIA of a proposed transit-oriented development plan in Oakland, CA</i>	ChangeLab Solutions, Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN), Transform, Asian Health Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Appendices • Supplementary research • Brief project summary
Long Beach Downtown Plan (2011)	<i>An HIA of a proposed area plan in Long Beach, CA</i>	East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, Californians for Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Executive summary
Pittsburg Railroad Avenue Specific Plan (2008)	<i>An HIA of a proposed transit-oriented development plan in Pittsburg, CA</i>	Contra Costa Interfaith Supporting Community Organization (CCISCO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pittsburg Case Story
University of Southern California Specific Plan (2012)	<i>An HIA of a proposed land use plan in Los Angeles, CA</i>	Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (SAJE), Esperanza Community Housing Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Appendices • Brief project summary • Analysis of final CBA agreement and HIA recommendations
Skatepark HIA (2014)	<i>An HIA of a proposed skatepark in San Diego, CA</i>	Mid-City Community Advocacy Network's Youth Council and Tony Hawk Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Report • Executive Summary
Housing			
Crossings at 29th Street (2008)	<i>An HIA of a proposed low-income housing development project in Los Angeles, CA</i>	LA ACORN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary • Final report • Brief project summary
Jack London Gateway (2006)	<i>An HIA of a proposed low-income senior housing development project in Oakland, CA</i>	West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final letter summarizing findings • Case study • Completed scoping worksheet • Brief project summary
Long Beach Housing Ele-	<i>An HIA of the proposed Hous-</i>	Housing Long Beach, Los Angeles Legal Aid Foundation (LAFLA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Appendices

	<i>ing Element in Long Beach, CA</i>		
Marin Housing Code Enforcement Policy (2012)	<i>An HIA of proposed changes to residential Code Enforcement policies in Marin County, CA</i>	Legal Aid of Marin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Brief project summary
Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Project (2012)	<i>An HIA of proposed federal regulations related to public housing management</i>	Advancement Project, National People's Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Executive summary • Brief project summary
San Francisco Public Housing Redevelopment (2009)	<i>A retroactive HIA of public housing redevelopment sites in San Francisco, CA</i>	University of California, Berkeley Health Impact Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report <p>As part of the HIA these videos were also created:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sneak Peak at Army Street • Living at Bernal Dwellings • Berann Introduces Her Neighborhood • The Ghetto Isn't What It Seems • Communities Getting Closer • The Skaters • The Tourist District
San Pablo Avenue Corridor (2009)	<i>An HIA of affordable housing sites for inclusion in a Specific Plan in El Cerrito and Richmond, CA</i>	Great Communities Collaborative, Urban Habitat, Greater Richmond Interfaith Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Brief project summary
Transportation			
I-710 Corridor Project (2011)	<i>An HIA of a proposed freeway expansion project in Los Angeles, CA</i>	LA Metro, Gateway Cities Council of Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Brief project summary • Scope of Work
Oakland Bus Rapid Transit (2012)	<i>An HIA of a proposed bus rapid transit line in Oakland, CA</i>	TransForm, Oakland Community Organizations, Allen Temple Arms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report
I-805 Bus Rapid Transit/47th St. Trolley Station Area Plan (2012)	<i>An HIA of adding proposed bus rapid transit to a trolley station in San Diego, CA</i>	San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Brief project summary
Education			
Restorative Justice Discipline Policies (2014)	<i>Restorative justice and health in Merced schools; Improving health impacts through school discipline</i>	Building Healthy Communities (BHC) – Merced, Merced Organizing Project, The California Endowment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary • Final report

	<i>policy in Merced, CA</i>		
School Integration Policies (2013)	<i>An HIA of a proposed policies to encourage school racial/ethnic integration in Minnesota</i>	ISAIAH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report
School Discipline Policies (2012)	<i>An HIA of alternative school discipline policies in Oakland, Salinas, and Los Angeles, CA</i>	CADRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary (English) • Executive Summary (Spanish) • Final report • Appendices • Brief project overview
Other Policy			
Family Unity, Family Health (2013)	<i>An examination of a continued policy of immigrant detentions and deportations at the federal level</i>	19 member Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Story
Paid Sick Days (2008-2012)	<i>A series of HIAs examining paid sick days legislation at local, state and federal levels</i>	San Francisco yDepartment of Public Health, Labor Project for Working Families, National Partnership for Women and Families, 9to5, as well as other state-specific partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Story
Wage Theft (2014)	<i>An HIA of the proposed Los Angeles Wage Theft Ordinance.</i>	Los Angeles Coalition Against Wage Theft: 9-5, CARECEN, CHIRLA, CLEAN Carwash Campaign, Garment Worker Center, IDEPSCA, KIWA, Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund, National Day Laborer Organizing Network, Pilipino Worker Center, Restaurant Opportunity of LA, UCLA Labor Center, UFCW 770, SEIU USWW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wage Theft HIA • Infographic • Infographic (Spanish) • Fact Sheet • Fact Sheet (Spanish) • Executive Summary • Video: <i>Working "Off the Clock"</i>
Lobos CO2 Pipeline HIA (2015)	<i>An HIA of a proposed carbon dioxide (CO2) pipeline project in Torrance County, New Mexico</i>	Partnership for a Healthy Torrance Community New Mexico Department of Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Summary • Full Report • Appendices