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OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENTATION

• 1. Understanding the context of the HII
  ▪ Health disparities and health equity.
  ▪ Equity vs. equality

• 2. The Utah’s Health Improvement Index (HII)
  ▪ Definition
  ▪ Classification
  ▪ Health indicators by HII group

• 3. Practical applications
  ▪ Trajectory of health
  ▪ How transportation affects health
  ▪ Working at the population and community level: The role of the HII
  ▪ How to use the HII in public and active transportation
Health disparities are more than differences in health outcomes.

The fact that some individuals or groups die sooner, or experience a disease more severely, than others is a necessary and yet insufficient condition to establish a disparity.

A disparity implies that the difference is *avoidable, unfair, and unjust*. 
ARE ALL HEALTH DIFFERENCES AVOIDABLE, UNFAIR AND UNJUST?

- Skiers in Utah have more leg/arm fracture than non-skiers
- Life expectancy in men is lower than in women
- Elderly adults have a higher arthritis prevalence than younger adults
- White women are more likely to be diagnosed with breast cancer than non-White women
HOW DO WE DECIDE WHAT IS AVOIDABLE, UNFAIR, AND UNJUST?

The difference is detrimental to groups that are already disadvantaged in opportunity and/or resources.

- Skiers in Utah have more leg/arm fracture than non-skiers
- Racial/ethnic minorities in Utah have a higher uninsurance rate than non-racial/ethnic minorities
- Life expectancy in men is lower than in women
- Life expectancy in men with less than a high school diploma is lower than in men with a college degree
- Elderly adults have a higher arthritis prevalence than younger adults
- Elderly adults in Piute County have a higher arthritis prevalence than elderly adults in Salt Lake County
- White women are more likely to be diagnosed with breast cancer than non-White women
- Lower-SES women are more likely to die of breast cancer than higher-SES women
HEALTH DISPARITIES are differences in health outcomes that are closely linked to economic, socio-cultural, and environmental/geographic disadvantage.

Health disparities are the metrics by which health equity is assessed.

HEALTH EQUITY is the principle behind the commitment to pursue the highest possible standard of health for all while focusing on those with the greatest obstacles.
EQUITY VS EQUALITY

- **Equality** involves treating every individual in the same manner, regardless of their needs.
- **Equity** involves treating each individual according to his or her needs.

Equality does not equal Equity.
The Utah’s Health Improvement Index (HII) is a composite measure of social determinants of health by geographic area.

- It includes nine indicators that describe important aspects of demographics, socioeconomic deprivation, economic inequality, resource availability, and opportunity structure.
- The higher the value, the more need for improvement in the area.
UTAH’S 99 SMALL AREAS

- First defined in 1997 by UDOH
- Reassessed in 2017-2018, and released in October 2018
- Defined based on ZIP Codes, local health district and county boundaries, community political boundaries, and input from local community representatives
- Range in population size from 7,400 to 89,000
- 73 of Utah’s 99 small areas are Urban
- 26 of Utah’s 99 small areas are rural or frontier.
1. Population aged ≥25 years with <9 years of education, %
2. Population aged ≥25 years with at least a high school diploma, %
3. Median family income, $
4. Income disparity
5. Owner-occupied housing units, % (home ownership rate)
6. Civilian labor force population aged ≥16 years unemployed, % (unemployment rate)
7. Families below poverty level, %
8. Population below 150% of the poverty threshold, %
9. Single-parent households with children aged <18 years, %
SMALL AREAS CATEGORIZED AS VERY HIGH OR HIGH ARE HEALTH DISPARITIES AREAS.

- The HII ranks from 72 to 161
- The 99 small areas are categorized in five groups

Health Disparity Areas
- Very High
- High
- Average
- Low
- Very Low

Adverse Health Outcome Areas

- The higher the index, the more improvement the area needs
CLASSIFICATION OF SMALL AREAS IN FIVE HII GROUPS

Urban Small Areas
- Very High HII >120: 11
- High HII >105 and <=120: 18
- Average HII >94 and <=105: 19
- Low HII >80 and <=94: 13
- Very Low HII <=80: 12

Rural/Frontier Small Areas
- Very High HII >120: 5
- High HII >105 and <=120: 2
- Average HII >94 and <=105: 6
- Low HII >80 and <=94: 8
- Very Low HII <=80: 5
VERY HIGH HII AREAS WERE FOUND IN OGDEN, WEST SALT LAKE COUNTY, EAST PROVO, CENTRAL UTAH, SOUTHEAST UTAH AND SOUTHWEST UTAH.
THE HII IDENTIFIES SMALL AREAS WITH HIGH NUMBERS OF RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES.
HEALTH INDICATORS BY HII GROUP

No Healthcare Coverage by HII

Infant Mortality Rate

Current Smoking by HII

Binge Drinking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Utah</th>
<th>Utah Small Area</th>
<th>HII Group</th>
<th>Population (^1) (2017)</th>
<th>% Racial/Ethnic Minority (^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99 Small Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,101,989</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Health District</th>
<th>Utah Small Area</th>
<th>HII Group</th>
<th>Population (^1) (2017)</th>
<th>% Racial/Ethnic Minority (^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear River LHD</td>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>25,384</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box Elder County (other) V2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>7.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tremonton</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16,839</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan V2</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>57,055</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>23,477</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cache County (Other)/Rich County (All) V2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24,191</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>8,998</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13,225</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber-Morgan LHD</td>
<td>Ben Lomond</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>62,407</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber County (East)</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>35,519</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan County</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ogden (Downtown)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>39,706</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Ogden</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>37,963</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy/Hooper</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>47,911</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverdale</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28,279</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis County LHD</td>
<td>Clearfield Area/Hooper</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>72,508</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Utah Department of Health, Center for Health Data and Informatics, IBIS version 2017
\(^2\) American Community Survey (ACS) 2013-2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Utah</th>
<th>Utah Small Area</th>
<th>HII Group</th>
<th>Population(^1) (2017)</th>
<th>% Racial/Ethnic Minority(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>99 Small Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,101,989</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health District</td>
<td>Utah Small Area</td>
<td>HII Group</td>
<td>Population (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Davis County LHD (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton/South Weber</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,944</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaysville/Fruit Heights</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,946</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,230</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,927</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,414</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,980</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Cross/West Bountiful</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,631</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bountiful</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,259</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salt Lake County LHD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Rose Park)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,676</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Avenues)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,944</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Foothill/East Bench)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,369</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magna</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,303</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Glendale) V2</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,631</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley (Center)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,999</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley (West) V2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,406</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley (East) V2</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,253</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Downtown) V2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,037</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Southeast Liberty)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,793</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Salt Lake</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,420</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City (Sugar House)</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,933</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millcreek (South)</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,755</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millcreek (East)</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,138</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health District</td>
<td>Holladay V2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25,388</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>42,156</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kearns V2</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>41,292</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylorsville (East)/Murray (West)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>38,345</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylorsville (West)</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>40,584</td>
<td>*5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35,173</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midvale</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>31,669</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Jordan (Northeast) V2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>32,061</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Jordan (Southeast)</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38,901</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Jordan (West)/Copperton</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>47,502</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Jordan V2</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>36,412</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daybreak</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>32,320</td>
<td>*4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy (West)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>27,577</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy (Center) V2</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>29,731</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy (Northeast)</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>25,288</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy (Southeast)</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>30,624</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>45,782</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverton/Bluffdale</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>42,867</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herriman</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>46,212</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 New ZIP code. Data not available.
4 New ZIP code. Data not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Health District</th>
<th>Utah Small Area</th>
<th>HII Group</th>
<th>Population (2017)</th>
<th>% Racial/Ethnic Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>99 Small Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,101,989</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health District</td>
<td>Utah Small Area</td>
<td>HII Group</td>
<td>Population (2017)</td>
<td>% Racial/Ethnic Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele County LHD</td>
<td>Tooele County (Other)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tooele Valley</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50,977</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County LHD</td>
<td>Eagle Mountain/Cedar Valley</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32,736</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>67,193</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>27,058</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>48,865</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>10,938</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasant Grove/Lindon</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60,088</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orem (North)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>39,647</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orem (West)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35,265</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orem (East)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23,128</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provo/BYU</td>
<td>Very high²</td>
<td>53,657</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provo (West City Center)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>34,403</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provo (East City Center)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>34,967</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salem City</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>9,812</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43,194</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>34,240</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>9,889</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah County (South) V2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Some small areas might have a high HII because of their high and transient college student population (See limitations. Page 20)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Health District</th>
<th>Utah Small Area</th>
<th>HII Group</th>
<th>Population (2017)</th>
<th>% Racial/Ethnic Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>99 Small Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,101,989</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health District</td>
<td>Utah Small Area</td>
<td>HII Group</td>
<td>Population (2017)</td>
<td>% Racial/Ethnic Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>27,286</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County LHD</td>
<td>Park City</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29,437</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summit County (East)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11,676</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch County LHD</td>
<td>Wasatch County</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32,105</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriCounty LHD</td>
<td>Daggett and Uintah County</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>36,220</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duchesne County</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20,031</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central LHD</td>
<td>Nephi/Mona</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>9,432</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta/Fillmore</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>10,074</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanpete Valley</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>22,136</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central (Other)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>22,911</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast LHD</td>
<td>Richfield/Monroe/Salina</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>15,078</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon County</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>20,290</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emery County</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10,077</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand County</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>9,677</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan LHD</td>
<td>Blanding/Monticello</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Juan County (Other)</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>7,401</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest LHD</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>89,133</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington County (Other) V2</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>10,443</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington City</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>24,937</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurricane/La Verkin</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>25,783</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivins/Santa Clara</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15,378</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health District</td>
<td>Utah Small Area</td>
<td>HII Group</td>
<td>Population¹ (2017)</td>
<td>% Racial/Ethnic Minority²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>99 Small Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,101,989</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health District</td>
<td>Utah Small Area</td>
<td>HII Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very high⁰</td>
<td>45,309</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest LHD (Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>24,714</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

- Trajectory of health
- Addressing the SDoH
  - The role of the HII
  - The role of active transportation
- Working at the community and population level
  - The role of active transportation
TRAJECTORY OF HEALTH

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH

a. Structural Drivers
b. Socio-cultural environment (people cluster)
c. Physical & built environment (place cluster)
c. Quality Healthcare

Healthy exposures & behaviors → Better health

Unhealthy exposures & behaviors → Poorer health

Decreased medical conditions → Decreased health care expenditures

Increased medical conditions → Increased health care expenditures
HOW DOES TRANSPORTATION AFFECT HEALTH

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH

Physical and build environment

Transportation

Active transportation

Walkable bikable Transit-oriented

Better air quality Promote physical activity Reduce stress

Healthier and active communities

Improve quality of Life Decreased health care expenditures

Motorized transportation

Public transportation

Individual transportation

Crashes Air pollution Physical Inactivity

Injuries Asthma, CDVD Obesity

Increased health care expenditures

Improve quality of Life Decreased health care expenditures
FROM A HEALTH CARE PERSPECTIVE (INDIVIDUAL LEVEL)

- **Purpose**: To address individual health-related social needs. To reduce health harming conditions affecting individuals.
- **Target**: Limited to a small segment of the population: high utilizers of health care services, Medicaid recipients, those who are already sick.
- **Desired Outcomes**: Improve health outcomes of sick individuals, decrease consumption of medical services, and reduce health care cost.

FROM A PUBLIC HEALTH PERSPECTIVE (COMMUNITY AND POPULATION LEVEL)

- **Purpose**: To improve the underlying social, environmental, and economic conditions affecting communities and populations.
- **Target**: Inclusive of everybody.
- **Desired Outcomes**: Improve living conditions and quality of life for communities and individuals.

Both of them are complementary, but different approaches
1. Focuses on communities and systems
2. Based on a combination of health indicators and determinants of health measures
3. Risky conditions – examines the role of policies and institutions in shaping those conditions
4. Emphasis on creating the conditions that promote healthy living
5. Integrated with community-development strategies that influence the determinants of health (e.g. housing, safety, transportation, education, access to health care, civic engagement, etc.)
HOW TO USE THE HII IN PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

**VERY HIGH AND HIGH HII AREAS**

- Lack of or non-reliable individual transportation.
- Might be the **only** transportation source to go to work, school or other places (grocery stores, clinics, recreational and cultural activities, etc.)
- Safety of the neighborhood could be an issue.
- Active and public transportation might be the only tool to cover some basic needs.

**AVERAGE, LOW, AND VERY LOW HII AREAS**

- Access to reliable car is not a problem.
- Public and active transit **is an option**.
- Safety of the neighborhood is not a problem.
- Active and public transportation is a asset that improves the quality of life and improves health.
THANK YOU! QUESTIONS?

HTTPS://WWW.HEALTH.UTAH.GOV/DISPARITIES/DATA.HTML
Wasatch Bike Plan
• By initiating bicycle and pedestrian master plans in every community in all four Wasatch Front counties, we’ll ensure safe, connected bicycling routes are always a priority.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN STANDARDS

Introduction & Process

This set of standards has been compiled to create a more comprehensive network of active transportation (bicycling and walking) facilities in Utah that can be implemented more easily and effectively. Additionally, these standards provide a sample scope for communities desiring to go it outside help. Whether the active transportation plan is being completed internally or by a consultant, it must include the following requirements and may include recommended elements in gray. The process, however, is the most important element. By including a broad representation of the community and appropriate partners, the active transportation plan will:

- Address community needs
- Meet the needs of the partners
- Can be implemented successfully
- Is broadly supported

Standards

Part 1. Partner Engagement

Involving internal and external partners in the planning process, as well as identifying and empowering community champions, creates an opportunity for comprehensive input and buy-in. Their unique perspectives will generate support for the plan as many of these partners will be critical to successful implementation:

- Includes at least a few of the following public officials: Mayor, City Manager, Planning Commission, County Council Member
- Includes all of the following municipal departments: Planning, Engineering, Public Works/Infrastructure
- Systemic, engagement goals: Transport, community members or stakeholders who are a willing to expand time, knowledge, and political will in order to implement the plan of the process.
- DOT region representatives
- MOB, BOD, or ADP representatives
- Recommended: Transit agency, neighboring city, health department, school district, Department of Public Safety/Utah Highway Safety Program, police department, public safety agencies, major employers, and work sites

Part 2. Public Engagement

At least two distinct methods of engagement and data collection must be utilized during all phases of the process in order to gather input from diverse community members:

- Open houses or meetings
- Online surveys
- Pop-up opportunities to comment on plans or maps online or in-person
- Interact sessions
- Pop-up meetings and attending existing events
- Walks and bike audits

Set the vision, goals, & objectives

The vision, goals, and objectives of an active transportation plan create the framework and guide all policy, project, and program recommendations. Completed during the first steps of the planning process, the vision is a strong statement of the community's future vision. Goals are broader statements describing desired results, objectives are specific, measurable initiatives that bolster the goals. Recommended: Reflects the vision or purpose of the community's and/or region's existing plans.

4. Existing or Current Conditions

Creating a clear image of what the community currently enables a meaningful comparison with what the community wants to be in the future. The analysis should use words, photos, maps, and data to describe:

- Exist on and off street bicycling and walking network and facility types
- Identification of network barriers and gaps
- Demographics
- Crash and safety data
- Integration with local and regional plans, including other active transportation plans
- Connections to transit and community destinations (e.g., parks, schools)

5. Recommendations

This section includes the following new infrastructure, supportive programs, and policies in order to promote better accommodation of people walking and bicycling.

A. Proposals. These are most critical recommendations that encourage active transportation use, regardless of age or ability. Each recommended facility must include at least:

- Built or built-up identification
- GIS schema consistent with state and regional standards
- Recommended projects connected to regionally significant existing or planned routes

B. Programs. Education, encouragement, evaluation, enforcement, and equity programs support the effectiveness of infrastructure (engineering) projects (5.4).

C. Policies. Policies, departmental procedures, design standards, and guidelines that promote active transportation usage and safety should be recommended.

6. Implementation Strategy

Creating an implementation strategy is a critical step in the active transportation planning process so that momentum and public support do not stall when the plan is finished. It should be detailed, yet easy to use. The plan should include:

- Prioritization and/or phased set of actions and recommendations
- Funding opportunities
- Capital and maintenance cost estimates and budget
- Recommended: Annual report on plan
- Recommended: Accountability or responsible for realization of recommendations

7. Performance Measures

Performance measures are effective ways to evaluate progress and the effectiveness of the implementation of recommendations. Measures should at least include:

- Walking and bicycling mode share
- Share of trips done by walking or bicycling
- Regular walking and bicycling counts and reporting at several high-profile locations
- Health indicators: crash and safety figures
What’s next?
WFRC Funding Programs

- Wasatch Front Economic Development District
- Community Development Block Grant Program
- Transportation & Land Use Connection Program
- Surface Transportation Program
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
- Transportation Alternatives Program
Mission: Support economic development plans, promote long-term economic competitiveness, and attract federal monies in order to implement local plans.

**Expand Employment**
- Planning Request: $100,000
- Develop strategies to expand employment in Utah’s advanced composites manufacturing industry and supply chain

**Encourage Entrepreneurship**
- Construction Request: $2,000,000
- Grow creative industries and connect people and organization to space, technology, and opportunity

**Workforce Training**
- Workforce Training Request: $614,000
- Provide workforce training to disadvantaged youth in the green construction industry
Mission: Support economic development plans, promote long-term economic competitiveness, and attract federal monies in order to implement local plans.

U.S. Economic Development Administration Funding Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Works &amp; Economic Adjustment Assistance</th>
<th>Regional Innovation Strategies</th>
<th>Local Technical Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $3,000,000</td>
<td>$0 – $500,000</td>
<td>$0 – $300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>Innovation Centers</td>
<td>Economic Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Retention</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Centers</td>
<td>Feasibility Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Cluster-Based Startups</td>
<td>Impact Analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage Private Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Regional Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
Small Cities Program

Program Purpose
The purpose of the CDBG Program is to assist in developing viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, principally for persons of low and moderate income.

Program Eligibility
Morgan, Tooele, and Weber Counties
HOUSING and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Total Funding for FY 2019
$870,000

- ADA Upgrades
  Morgan County $210,000

- Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk
  Marriott-Slaterville $323,152

- Culinary Water Project
  Uintah City $36,848
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program

ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

- Planning
- Building Rehabilitation
- Removal of ADA Barriers
- Public Safety Equipment
- Property Acquisition for Public Purposes
- Promotion of Neighborhood Centers
- Create/Rehab. Recreation Facilities
- Demolish Buildings to Reduce Slum/Blight
- Install/Modify Public Works Infrastructure
- Construct/Reconstruct Streets, Water, Sewer Facilities
- Housing Lot Acquisition for Multiple-Family Housing Construction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>November-January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Attend How to Apply workshop</td>
<td>• Attend How to Apply workshop • Conduct income surveys • Hold first public hearing</td>
<td>• Submit applications in WebGrants • Consolidated Plans due</td>
<td>• Awards announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TLC PROGRAM GOALS

Maximize the **value of investment** in public infrastructure

Enhance **access to opportunity**

Increase **travel options** to optimize mobility

Create **communities** with opportunities to live, work, and play
TLC PROJECTS

PLANS
Visions
Community Engagement
Downtown Master Plans
Active Transportation

POLICIES
Zoning Ordinances
Design Standards
Transportation Priorities

PRODUCTS
Financing Options
Implementation Strategies
RDA Support

STUDIES AND ANALYSES (Parking, Market, etc.)
FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP)

CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP)

FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP)
Eligible STP Project Types

• Street widening or new construction
• Improve or reconstruct existing streets
• Bridge replacement
• Projects that reduce traffic demand
• Intersection improvements
5600 West – 6200 South to 7000 South Reconstruct & Widen
CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)
Eligible CMAQ Project Types

- Projects that improve Air Quality
- Construct or purchase public transportation facilities and equipment
- Commuter bicycle & pedestrian facilities
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- Projects that reduce traffic demand
- Intersection improvements
Construct/Purchase Public Transportation Facilities and Equipment

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

Urban Area – Signal Interconnect

Commuter Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP)
Eligible TAP Project Types

- Construction, planning, and design
- Pedestrian, bicyclists, & other non-motorized forms of transportation
- Improvements could include:
  - Sidewalks
  - Bicycle infrastructure
  - Traffic calming techniques
  - Lighting and safety-related infrastructure for non-drivers
- Safe Routes to School projects
D&RGW Rail/ Trail
WFRC Funding Program Deadlines

We’re Here

August 2019
Funding Programs Announced

August 2019
Notice for Letters of Intent Sent

September 2019
Letters of Intent Due

December 2019
Applications Due

Spring 2020
Projects Recommended
For More Information

Wasatch Front Regional Council

www.wfrc.org  801-363-4250

Scott Hess  x1104
shess@wfrc.org

Christy Dahlberg  x5005
christy@wfrc.org

Megan Townsend  x1101
mtownsend@wfrc.org

Ben Wuthrich  x1121
bwuthrich@wfrc.org