



Cannery HIA Eau Claire Area Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

**Eau Claire City-County Health Department, Room 302
Thursday August 18th, 2016 8:00-9:30 am**

Present: Audrey Boerner, Dale Peters, David Klinkhammer, Grant Dvorak, James Dunning, Kathy Mitchell, Lieske Giese, Mel Kantor, Ned Noel

Agenda:

1) Welcome & Introductions

- a) Introductions of HIA project team and committee members present were made around the room.
- b) Audrey shared a brief recap of the progress of the project with the committee, via brief PowerPoint presentation. She explained the project team's current focus is the Assessment phase – describing the baseline health of the people/groups affected by the potential decision, then predicting potential health effects of the decision. She explained that during this stage, background and health impact questions would be used by the project team to highlight evidence (through literature) to develop recommendations for developers. Committee members were given handouts with background and health impact questions relating to each of the three focus areas: Parks & Trails, Transportation & Access, and Housing. Audrey then shared the goal of the meeting: to discuss, refine, and prioritize the background and health impact questions, and gather additional data sources to help guide the project team's research.
- c) The group discussed the context for the HIA, that this is part of a larger effort to evaluate how the HIA tool works for the Eau Claire, and whether this or another tool is best suited to incorporating health considerations in community development. This effort also strives to build local capacity to conduct HIAs.

2) Pathway Diagram Recap

- a) Audrey also gave a brief recap on pathway diagrams discussed at the last meeting. The purpose of the recap was to connect potential developments in the Cannery District to health impacts and outcomes. Audrey also walked the committee through the process of how the team developed background and health impact questions from the pathway diagrams that the committee refined. She shared that the goal of the background questions is to answer "What is

the current state of things now, before redevelopment occurs?” The goal of the health impact questions is to provide information from literature that can answer “If this development occurs in X way, what are the potential positive and negative health impacts?”

3) Review background questions and health impact questions

- a) Before discussing the background and health impact questions as small groups, committee members were given 10 minutes to individually look at the background and health impact questions and identify “Which of these questions are most important to you, and why?”
- b) The committee was then split into two small groups and given time to discuss the background and health impact questions, with project team members present to facilitate discussion. Each group was asked to review the questions and answer, “what are the highest priority questions?” and “can you identify data sources or experts to help answer them?” The goal of the small group discussion was to engage the committee’s assistance and expertise to narrow down questions to ones that are the most relevant in terms of providing recommendations and data sources.

4) Large Group Discussion

- a) After small group discussion, Audrey reconvened the large group to discuss the background and health impact questions as a committee. The group reached consensus that the background and health impact questions presented by the team covered important points of concern, and were valid questions. Key points of discussion from each category of questions were as follows:

(1) Transportation

- (a)** Safety/security – how is crime impacted by transportation infrastructure? (those living in the Cannery District, and those going into, through, and coming out of the district.)
- (b)** Access for everyone – those coming into the district, moving through, and coming out of it.
- (c)** Current issues affecting the district related to transportation, safety, and crime.
- (d)** Fostering community connection and increasing social cohesion for all types of users (those who walk, bike, use public transport, etc.).

(2) Housing

- (a)** Design of mixed income/elderly housing – how to maximize safety and social cohesion through housing design.

- (b) What is the right ratio of mixed income in a mixed housing development to be successful?
 - (c) Is there a desired density level for each income level (low, middle, upper)?
 - (d) Existing and new housing – how can new mixed income housing be successfully merged with existing housing in this area?
- (3) Parks**
- (a) Factors of park design that increase actual and perceived safety
 - (b) Social cohesion – How do we increase social cohesion and attractiveness of the park?
 - (c) “Neighborhood” oriented park vs. community /“destination” park - What are amenities/factors that attract both local neighborhood residents and community members at-large to the park? (with a goal of increasing social cohesion)

5) Wrap up & next steps

- a) After concluding large group discussion, Audrey noted the next steps for the team: incorporating the committee’s feedback into the background and health impact questions, and conducting literature searches to answer the questions. Progress to be shared at the next committee meeting.

Next Meeting: Thursday, October 20th, 8-9:30am

Location: Eau Claire City-County Health Department Room 302