



LIVABLE COMMUNITIES: SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

8.3.2018

**Live
Healthy
Napa
County**



**Vive
Saludable
Condado
de Napa**

On August 3, 2018, the Live Healthy Napa County collaborative met to share and discuss experiences and information relating to Napa County's social environment. In particular, meeting attendees discussed issues relating to themes of *Respect and Social Inclusion, Social Participation, and Civic Participation and Employment*.

These three themes are part of the *Livable Communities* framework, developed by the World Health Organization, adapted by the American Association of Retired Persons, and adapted further by Napa County, for understanding and building a community that is able to support the health and well-being of residents of all ages and from all backgrounds. The LHNC collaborative, with administrative support and direction from Napa County's Health and Human Services Division of Public Health, is using the Livable Communities framework to conduct a community health assessment in 2018.

Participants at the August meeting engaged in two primary activities, sharing their (and their clients or constituents') social environment-related experiences and providing feedback on social environment-related community health data collected and organized by the Napa County DPH. The following pages present the working versions of selected health indicators with accompanying data and the highlights of participant feedback to these data.



◆ **Overall feedback: The data are understandable but need more description**

N=2, comments were to break down the data, specifically by race/ethnicity for all data points, especially crime

◆ **For Social Vulnerability Index**

N=2, comments were to separate and break down the data at the level of each of the 15 factors, possibly mapping out each factor and having an overlay option to display the data, population data to understand rates.

N=2, comments were that the data are both helpful and confusing. Cities contain the most vulnerable populations but weren't the most affected during the fire. The map and factors do not provide easy visualization for the data concept. The definition of vulnerability and infographic are clear.

N=1, comments were to map the city boundaries with more definition when displaying the data

◆ **For Social Connectedness**

N=3, comments were to break down the data by explaining who is included and provide the break down, and to break down the data by ethnic/language and by age. *NOTE: breaking down data may be difficult given the small sample size and source.

◆ **For Municipal Equality Index**

N=1, comments were to measure quality and have the data indicators checked. Questions arose about to what degree to have it checked.

N=1, comments were for other populations: use the framework for other disenfranchised groups (women, immigration status, etc.)

◆ **For Crime**

N=3, comments were to break down the data by city/neighborhoods and crime type; provide information on "Other side of crime rates," e.g., incarceration— who is being stopped in cars?

◆ **For Youth**

N=1, comments were to bring up youth experiences/ACEs data in factors that affect health



LIVABLE COMMUNITIES: SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

8.3.2018 Data Salon Feedback Highlights (N= # stakeholders in agreement)

Social Participation

- ◆ **Overall feedback: The data need to be broken down and some data is not presented clearly**

N=2, comments were to break down the data by age, race/ethnicity, ability levels; this will affect all categories/measures. Requested to break down data by age; there's a difference between the experiences and implications of data for 65 and 5 year-olds.

N=3, comments were to clarify the presentation of the data. Example: How are places of Arts & Culture (AC) & other measures connected? The charts seem disconnected. The focus is narrow. The description of the measures is not the same as the examples.

- ◆ **For Arts and Culture**

N=9, folks were curious about access to locations and the relevance of this information. Comments were to include libraries, senior centers, the college, more diversity of places of AC in AMCAN, and parks/built environment. Are places of AC reflective of what the community likes, wants, or uses?

N=5, comments around access and relevancy were that many cost money and may not be relevant to populations of concern. Can we measure the advertising of social activity-related places, events? Availability doesn't equal access; are these places reflective of the community's interests or ability to engage? What about other times of the year, etc.?

- ◆ **For Social Connectedness**

N=5, comments were to break down data (e.g. by age & gender) and research further into it. Is the population surveyed indicative of the county-wide population? Overlay this data with the Emergency Food System data; how often do folks share a meal with someone, this is a social connectedness issue? This is a small sample size & not representative of the general population.

- ◆ **For Meaningful Participation in School**

N=6, comments were to break down the data (e.g., by race/ethnicity, geography) and research further into it. What is the frequency of participation? Not all can participate; things like age, race/ethnicity, ability affect participation. We could look at a youth group and how they spend their lunch hours. There needs to be some clarity as to what participation was during school versus at after-school events. Add STEM Engagement? What time of day is this? What kind? How about sports, clubs?



♦ **Overall feedback: The data are understandable and would be useful, especially with some further break down**

N=5, comments were to provide greater resolution on demographic breakdowns; e.g. race/ethnicity and age (all data), employment among LGBTQ populations and retirees wishing to work would be informative.

N=3, comment was to provide greater information on what key words mean; e.g. what is the difference between formal and informal/volunteer work? What is formal vs. informal civic engagement? Terms such as “community problems” should be better defined.

For Employment Rate

N=3, comments were that certain key demographic groups weren't represented in the data; retirees were not included in this data; LGBTQ employment rate is not provided

N= 5, comments were to provide greater resolution of the data; what about part-time vs. full-time workers and/or those eligible for benefits vs. those who are not? Employment in type of industry would be helpful. More information on the un- and under-employed population would also be helpful; measures of working poor and the number of jobs people hold is informative.

N=2, comments were around employment and residence. Of the workforce in Napa County, do they live here or commute? Who lives here and who doesn't?

For Voter Turnout

N=1, comment was that it would be helpful to see more information on changes in voter turnout.

N=1, comment was that it would be interesting to know what preferred voter languages were.

For Engagement in Community Issues

N=2, comments were to clarify the shift in engagement levels. What are the reasons for engagement and dropping engagement in recent years?

N=1, comment inquired about participation in local boards or commissions

N=1, comment was to provide greater resolution at the geographic level