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May 7, 1884—Nineteen Health officials met in D.C. and formed the National Conference of State Boards of Health...

“for mutual aid and advice in regard to work, for conference and cooperation in interstate sanitary work, and for bringing the combined influence of the health organizations in the states to bear in securing such concert of action and national legislation as might be required from time to time, for the protection of the health interests of the whole country.”

J. N. McCormack, MD
Kentucky State Health Official
ASTHO History

ASTHO officially formed in 1942 to...
- Provide a network for State Health Officials and agencies
- Advocate the interests of state-based public health at the national level.
- Provide a forum to share best practices in health policy and programs
Environmental Health: Member Perspective

- Includes lead poisoning programs, non-point source pollution control, air quality, solid and hazardous waste management, hazardous materials training, radon, water quality and pollution control (including safe drinking water, fishing advisories, and swimming), water and waste disposal systems, pesticide regulation and disposal, and nuclear power safety. Also includes food service and lodging inspections.
Environmental Health: ASTHO Focus Areas

- **Safe Food and Water** (outbreak prevention and response, intentional and unintentional contamination, security)
- **Environmental Health Infrastructure and Capacity** (workforce development, surveillance, environmental public health tracking, IT infrastructure)
- **Built and Synthetic Environment** (indoor environmental quality, chemical safety, health impact assessments, health in all policies)
- **Natural Environment** (climate change, vector-borne and other zoonotic, natural disasters)
## Hazardous Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>2010 Percentage of State Health Agencies</th>
<th>2012 Percentage of State Health Agencies</th>
<th>2016 Percentage of State Health Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental epidemiology</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety training/education</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation control</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicology</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radon control</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor air quality</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private water supply safety</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public water supply safety</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector control</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater protection</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water protection</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazmat response</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor air quality</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste disposal</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting unused pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison control</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise pollution</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pollution prevention</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal zone management</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito control</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Air pollution and mosquito control only appeared on the 2010 Profile Survey.*
PFAS

- Risk Communication of Waterborne Contaminants
  - Project Leads: Kerry Wyss and Nick Porter

- PFAS Exposure Assessment Technical Tools: State Implementation and Feedback Pilot Grants
  - Project Leads: Kathy Dolan and Nick Porter
Risk Communication of Waterborne Contaminants

- Collaborative project between EPA, ECOS, and ASTHO
- Contaminants of Interest:
  - Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs)
  - PFAS
- Conducted interviews with state health and environmental agencies
- Produced 13 case studies on risk communication strategies and lessons learned
- Case studies can be found [here](#)
- Webinar recordings can be found [here](#) (PFAS) and [here](#) (HABs)
PFAS Exposure Assessment Technical Tools: State Implementation and Feedback Pilot Grants

- **Purpose**: To provide state health agencies with the opportunity to implement and evaluate CDC/ATSDR’s PFAS Exposure Assessment Technical Tools (PEATT)
- **Funding Amount**: $175,000 for two state health agencies
- **Chosen Grantees**: Pennsylvania Department of Health and New York State Department of Health
CDC/ATSDR’s PFAS Exposure Assessment Technical Tools (PEATT)

- Toolkit provides a step by step protocol to conduct a statistically based biomonitoring investigation for community exposures to PFAS
- Assumed that main exposure source is contaminated drinking water
- In addition to the 8 step protocol outlined in the PEATT, the toolkit contains sampling protocols, lab analysis protocols, communication materials, question banks, etc.
- Interested parties can request a copy of the PEATT at PFAS@cdc.gov
PFAS Exposure Assessment Technical Tools: State Implementation and Feedback Pilot Grants

- **Pennsylvania Department of Health**
  - Testing for 11 PFAS chemicals
  - Testing at NYSDOH’s Wadsworth Center
  - ~230 individuals interviewed and tested
  - Evaluating PEATT through surveys and final interview

- **New York State Department of Health**
  - Testing for 11 PFAS chemicals
  - Testing at NYSDOH’s Wadsworth Center
  - ~150 individuals interviewed and tested
  - Evaluating PEATT through surveys and final interview
ATSDRs APPLETREE Cooperative Agreement

25 Funded States
2018 ASTHO APPLETREE State Capacity Assessment

- 35 participants from 30 jurisdictions participated, including:
  - 16 current APPLETREE recipients
  - 4 past APPLETREE recipients
  - 7 non-recipients
- 17 agencies responded that they have programs to conduct hazardous waste site assessment
- 13 agencies reported the need for more toxicologist positions
- 11 reported the need for more positions for environmental health scientists
Current and past recipients report higher quality of hazardous waste site assessment resources than nonrecipients.

Current recipients primarily rely on federal funding.

Past recipients rely mostly on state funding.

Current recipients report higher program capacity than past recipients and nonrecipients.
Challenges? Opportunities!

- Helping enhance CDC/ATSDR and EPA products/services
- ASTHO-ECOS-EPA MOA
- Health in All Policies (HiAP)
  - 2016 President’s Challenge on Advancing Health Equity and Optimal Health for All
Thank You!

Kathy Dolan
kdolan@astho.org