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Local Legal Epidemiology and Policy Surveillance – Why?

- LE and PS can build staff capacity and competency.
- LE and PS can be used to help define a policy role of HD in a community.
- Datasets can be used to evaluate policies of interest.
- Datasets can be used to communicate with and convene leadership and partners.
- Datasets can be used to create new, or amend existing, policies.
Local Legal Epi Project – Why?

- Use of law and policy to address public health poorly understood
  - Decision-makers often lack a holistic understanding of public health law evidence
  - Few STLTs study the impact of laws and policies to know what works

- STLTs face challenges to understanding law and policy
  - Constantly evolving environment
  - No comprehensive databases (particular for TLTs)
  - Limited access to legal support

- Can legal epi and policy surveillance...
  - ...help HDs address these issues?
  - ...be integrated into HD operations?
Local Legal Epi Project – What and When?

Two Years:

- **The Locals Project – 2016**
  - A pilot project of 9 local jurisdictions to learn about and use public health law research tools on topics of importance

- **The STLTs Project - 2018**
  - A pilot project of 6 STLT jurisdictions to identify and fill public health law research gaps on topics of importance
Local Legal Epi Project – What?

The Locals Project – 2016

- Recruit LPHDs – 9 jurisdictions participated
- Topic selection – a somewhat controlled process
  - Tobacco Control
  - Air Toxics/Pollution Enforcement
  - E-Cigarette Control
  - Isolation and Quarantine
  - Recreational Marijuana
  - Equitable Access to Food
  - Complete Streets
  - Communicable Disease Reporting
  - Food Operations Licensure
Local Legal Epi Project – What?

The Locals Project – 2016

- Scope the legal datasets
- Draft coding questions
- Conduct legal research
- Code legal text
- Perform quality control and publish
Local Legal Epi Project – What did we learn?

The Locals Project – 2016 – Policy surveillance:

- LHD willing and able to learn methods;
- Requires dedicated staff resources, schedules/deadlines can be tough to keep;
- Learning to perform takes significant time and resources;
- Benefits from a transdisciplinary team of lawyers and non-lawyers;
- LHD interest and feasibility should drive topic selection;
- Accessing local laws for PS is challenging.
Local Legal Epi Project – What?

The STLT Project – 2018

- Recruit LHDs – 6 jurisdictions participated (with 2 withdrawing)
- Trained in PS and legal epi
- Select and scope topics;
  - Local-level law/policy incentives to improve access to health foods
  - Local inclusionary zoning policies
  - Local eviction protection provisions
  - Tobacco-Free Schools and Asthma Friendly Schools
- Collected and analyzed laws;
- Coded the laws and perform quality control;
- Drafted research protocol and a report; and
- Published the data to LawAtlas.org.
Local Legal Epi Project – What did we learn?

The STLT Project – 2018 - Legal epi and Policy surveillance:

- Projects are complex, take time, and deadlines are tough to meet;
- Teams need legal research skills;
- Selecting a topic is challenging, but critical to the success of the project;
- Seen as valuable to HDs;
- Building capacity for legal epi is clearly feasible.
Local Legal Epi Project – What did we learn?

The STLT Project – 2018

- Finding time to do the work is challenging.
- LE and PS provide a new way to look at policy and evaluation.
- Deliverables are useful for communicating upward and outward.
Local Legal Epi Project – What did we learn?

The STLT Project – 2018

- Helps define space for PH to work in the policy area.
- “Champions” for the work within the HD are important.
- Building LE and PS infrastructure into HD is essential for work to continue.
- HDs see that this work can connect to policy change in a very effective way.
Local Legal Epidemiology Project – Success!!

- LHDs want to do legal epi.
- LHDs can do legal epi.
- Legal epi is transdisciplinary, with non-lawyer HD professionals able to do the work.
- We’re starting to learn what HDs need to do it better.
City Policy Surveillance: Eviction Law as a Case Study

MEGAN E. HATCH, PH.D.
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Previous Research

Dissertation on state landlord-tenant laws

Data: State statutes

Methodology

◦ Located and coded statutes
◦ Constructed legislative history
  ◦ Enactment vs. adoption dates
  ◦ Amendments
Previous Research

Very time consuming

No built-in quality control or redundancy checks

Data not in a user-friendly format
  ◦ Especially after several years
  ◦ Inefficient pattern identification

Not publicly available
Previous Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Creating Statute</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
<th>Date Amendments</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitions</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 1</td>
<td>(A) &quot;Tenant&quot; means 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>140 v S 244 (Eff 3-20-84);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent, atny</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 2</td>
<td>(A) Subject to sect 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 3</td>
<td>(A) Notwithstanding 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>145 v H 438, Eff 10-12-94;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student rental agreements</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 3</td>
<td>A college or university 145 v H 438, Eff 10-12-94;</td>
<td>10/12/1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wh</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 4</td>
<td>(A) A landlord who is 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>143 v S 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access, atny</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 4</td>
<td>(A) A landlord who is 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>Original nr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duties of tenant</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 5</td>
<td>(A) A tenant who is 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>143 v S 258, Eff 8-22-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex offender</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 5</td>
<td>(A) (1) No tenant of 150 v S 5, § 1, eff. 7-31-03</td>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>152 v S 10, § 1, eff. 7-1-07;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terms allowed in lease</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 6</td>
<td>A landlord and a tenant 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>143 v S 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrongful remedies for landlord failures</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 7</td>
<td>(A) If a landlord fails 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure for above remedy</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 8</td>
<td>(A) Whenever a tenant 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>136 v H 49, Eff 9-1-75;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure for above remedy</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 9</td>
<td>(A) A landlord who is 135 v S 103 (Eff 11-4-74)</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>143 v S 258, Eff 8-22-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure for above remedy</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 10</td>
<td>(A) If a landlord brings 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landlord remedy for tenant noncomply damages for breach of contract</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 11</td>
<td>If the tenant fails to 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>143 v S 258, Eff 8-22-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terms prohibited in lease</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 12</td>
<td>In any action under 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courts determine lease enforcement</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 13</td>
<td>(A) No provision of the 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>143 v S 258, Eff 8-22-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>util, atny</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 14</td>
<td>(A) If the court as a 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scint, sdwr, scidmg, sdret</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 15</td>
<td>(A) No landlord of 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 16</td>
<td>(A) Any security dep 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written address info</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 17</td>
<td>(A) Except as provid 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td>143 v S 258, Eff 8-22-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supremacy of this section</td>
<td>Title 53, Chapter 5321, Section 18</td>
<td>(A) Every written ren 135 v S 103, Eff 11-4-74</td>
<td>11/4/1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndc</td>
<td>§ 4112.02</td>
<td>It shall be an una 144 v H 321</td>
<td>6/30/1992</td>
<td>128 v 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Solution

CPHLR and The Policy Surveillance Program
How I Got Here

Twitter
  ◦ Nuisance database

Conversations with CPHLR staff

Inaugural CPHLR Research Fellow

Summer funding from the Levin Women’s Fund
The Project: Why Evictions?

More than 898,000 families each year are evicted
- New data on rates across cities and states

Long-lasting effects
- Housing: Availability, quality, living arrangements
- Health: Mental, physical, adults, children
- Jobs
- Children

We don’t know
- Scope and variety of policies
- What works to reduce unnecessary evictions
The Project

Eviction laws in 40 of the largest U.S. cities
- Spread across the four Census regions

What we wanted to know
- What cities legislate
- How laws vary
- How laws influence the time and cost of eviction
Sample Cities
The Project

Partnership with CPHLR
- Me, CPHLR lawyers and project managers
- Cleveland State University research assistant
- CPHLR interns

Iterative process
SPRING 2018
Initial conversations with CP HLR.

May 2018
Began partnership.

June 2018
Project scoping.

July-Aug 2018
Finalize questions. Preliminary coding.

September 2018 – Current
Redundancy coding. Codebook development.

November 2018 – Current
Paper development.
Example Question

3. For what causes can a landlord evict a tenant?

- Nonpayment of rent
- Criminal activity
- Renovations to bring building in compliance with code
- Material and irreparable breach of lease
- Material breach of lease
- Remaining on the property after expiration of the lease
- Statutory tenant obligations
- None
- Other

Citations (Drag citation tags in the source text and drop onto question title)

Caution Flag
- Yes
- No
Conceptual Framework
Challenges

Question selection
- There is so much to catalog!
- What is interesting and important variation

Data complexity
- Which government regulates what

Coordination
- Teams in two cities
- Technology
Challenges

Timeline synchronization
- Academic vs. policy timelines
- Interns/research assistants were temporary

Database expansion
- Limited geographic scope
- Not longitudinal
Overcoming Challenges

Question selection
- Two heads are better than one
- Combination of legal and subject-matter policy expertise
- Decision rules

Data complexity
- Learning opportunity
- Hybrid approach

Coordination
- Frequent phone calls
- Policy surveillance training
- Technology
- Patience
Overcoming Challenges

Timeline synchronization
- Extending intern/research assistant contracts
- Reality of different actors/goals

Database expansion
- Next steps
What I’ve Learned

Value of policy surveillance
- Makes research easier
- Clarifies thinking
- Potential for future usage

Patience
- Iterative process, but doing it right will save you time in the long run

We know even less than we thought!
Next Steps

Presenting early results at Urban Affairs Association Conference (April 2019)

Drafting first academic paper
  • Law review article to follow

Finalize code book

Release the data to the public!

Expand the project
  • Grant seeking
  • Match laws to eviction data (The Eviction Lab at Princeton)
Conclusion: Why Policy Surveillance Matters

Systematic, transdisciplinary approach

Partnership creates better data, faster

Data can be used by many people, not just the data collector

- Research
- Evaluation
- Advocacy
- Policy making
Thank you

M.E.HATCH@CSUOHIO.EDU

@MEGANEHATCH
WHAT IS CITYHEALTH?

• **An initiative** of the de Beaumont Foundation and Kaiser Permanente that aims **to help cities thrive** through policies that improve people’s day-to-day lives.

• **A package of nine policy recommendations** with significant potential to boost health, well-being, and quality of life by addressing the key social determinants.
Scores to assess and improve policies that affect residents’ health and well-being with ratings of the nation’s 40 largest cities.

The ratings are the culmination of an assessment of how these 40 cities fare across nine policies that can significantly advance people’s quality of life.

We award gold, silver, bronze, or no medal overall and in each of our policy areas.
Pragmatic, Achievable, Aspirational:

- The evidence base of policies that address the key determinants of health
- Must be under the cities’ jurisdictional authority and precedent
- Analysis by a policy advisory committee
CITY HEALTH’S NINE POLICIES

- Affordable Housing
- Alcohol Sales Control
- Complete Streets
- Earned Sick Leave
- Food Safety/Restaurant Inspection Rating
- Healthy Food Procurement
- High-Quality Universal Pre-K
- Smoke Free Indoor Air
- Tobacco 21
CITYHEALTH’S PROCESS
OBJECTIVES

• **Assess** how the 40 largest US cities stack up when it comes to the number and quality of these policies on their books.

• **Support cities** who want to take action on implementing these policies.
Collect and code all relevant laws, statutes, executive orders and regulations in each of the 40 cities.

Work with leading national issue experts to set scoring criteria; sort policies into gold, silver, bronze and no-medal categories.

Provide city leaders with an opportunity to vet their assessments for accuracy.
City received 5 or more gold medals across each of the 9 policies

City received 5 or more gold or silver medals across each of the 9 policies

City received 4 or more gold, silver, or bronze medals across each of the 9 policies
2018 KEY FINDINGS
# Overall Medal Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITIES THAT MOVED UP IN 2018

10 CITIES WITH IMPROVED OVERALL MEDAL STATUS from 2017 to 2018

- Albuquerque
- Austin
- Kansas City
- Long Beach
- Louisville
- Milwaukee
- Portland
- San Antonio
- San Jose
- Seattle
CITY POLICY MEDALS

Affordable Housing
13 cities received a medal

Earned Sick Leave
19 cities received a medal

High-Quality Universal Pre-K
33 cities received a medal

Alcohol Sales Control
15 cities received a medal

Food Safety/Restaurant Inspection Rating
15 cities received a medal

Smoke Free Indoor Air
36 cities received a medal

Complete Streets
32 cities received a medal

Healthy Food Procurement
16 cities received a medal

Tobacco 21
15 cities received a gold medal
In just one year, cities earned 24 new policy medals.
Liz Voyles
Vice President of Communications, CityHealth
liz@cityhealth.org, 202-297-9641

Follow us!
@city_health  
Facebook.com/cityhealthorg

Sign up to receive updates at cityhealth.org/join-us
How to use WebEx Q&A

1. Open the Q&A panel by clicking the “…” button on the bottom of the screen and selecting “Q&A”
2. Select “All Panelists”
3. Type your question
4. Click “Send”
Thank You!

Join us April 9 at 1:00 p.m. ET for our next webinar:

Policy Surveillance for Research

Register at bit.ly/ExplorePS19