Health Risks Associated With Water Mist Systems
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Water mist systems are commonly used to cool public places, but they can be colonized by opportunistic premise plumbing pathogens that cause infections in people. Adequate knowledge of health risks associated with these systems is important to avoid exposing people to these pathogens. This month’s cover article explores the awareness and knowledge of business owners and environmental health officers regarding the health risks associated with the use of water mist systems in Australia. The study found that a majority of owners and environmental health officers were not aware of the health risks. Furthermore, it was reported that there are no regulations for the installation and operation of these systems.
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The past year has gone by so quickly and I am writing my final column as president of the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA). During the past year, I have had the opportunity to attend the American Public Health Association (APHA) conference, several state environmental health association conferences, and an in-person board meeting that my predecessor was not so fortunate to do. I am thankful for these opportunities, even though the year did not turn out as I had envisioned. When I ran to be your NEHA president, I had planned to meet people around the country, talk about the great ideas of other professionals, and share the lessons I learned. Though I am saddened that I could not do as much as I had hoped, I still met many great professionals this year.

During the meetings that I attended, one of the common topics discussed was the lack of understanding of what environmental health professionals do. So many great people are out there doing their jobs and wondering why they never received a thank you or even an acknowledgement when their nursing counterparts in local health departments are getting the credit. Repeatedly I was asked what NEHA was doing or what we could do to improve recognition of the environmental health profession. This question was also not lost on the NEHA Board of Directors this year. Many of us are asking the same questions internally. NEHA has made some progress promoting the profession this year; we have hired a well-qualified marketing team and were able to have some U.S. representatives and senators mention environmental health in Congress and around the country. What NEHA has not been able to do yet is to convince our members and members of the profession to help themselves. NEHA will be focusing on this area in the near future.

This year was an eye-opener in many ways. I have learned that our profession has some of the greatest minds practicing the profession when it comes to solving problems, yet we do not know how to talk about ourselves. In many ways, we are an extremely apathetic group. I hear that we are too busy to promote environmental health or that we are not allowed to talk about environmental health to legislators or other lawmakers. I have seen in many cases that we do not even want to talk about ourselves to other public health professionals. This problem is systemic from federal government agencies down to the smallest local health departments. It is also a problem in our state and regional affiliate associations. Please do not get me wrong, there are places where we are doing yeoman’s work, but going the extra mile needs to become systemic in the other direction.

Before I get too preachy, I understand that some of us still have travel restrictions and many state budgets are stretched. Yet, I have also heard that many local health departments are currently flush with funds they do not know how they are going to spend. At the NEHA 2022 Annual Educational Conference (AEC) & Exhibition this summer and in other means in the future, we will create a tool kit to help you promote yourself. NEHA does not have the staff to work with all your councils, commissioners, and boards of health. We also do not have the budget to run national media campaigns to tell the public what we do and why we do it.

Our profession needs to become bold and willing to step up to the plate when doing things for ourselves. I recently heard from a great professional and friend who said, “Why? Nobody cares!” At a recent joint conference of APHA and NEHA state affiliates, I also heard that no one from the environmental health side attended. Are we staying at home because no one plays nice with us, or is it because we have our petty differences preventing us from flying high? Whatever the reason, we need to step up. My friend was correct in a way—society is wrapped up in its own problems and unless we participate in our own way, we will never break that barrier between them and us.

Environmental health is public health; we created public health, not nursing or community health. At a time when most people attributed sickness to superstition and the wrath of the gods, Hippocrates taught that all forms of illness had a natural cause. Nearly 2,500 years later, environmental health professionals are still on the front lines of prevention. Hygiene and sanitation have been the single biggest contributor to increased lifespans. We should be shouting this fact from the rooftops. We should be talking to policy makers at all levels. We should be talk-
ing to junior high and high school students to spark career interests or create awareness. We should participate in science fairs. We should also be calling our local TV and radio stations and telling them about what we are doing. Many reporters have to search for stories every morning and we can use this opportunity to our advantage. Newspapers are fighting to remain relevant in a world where the internet, TV, and radio always beat them to the story. We could help them out by giving them something fresh to write about. Civic groups are another place to get the word out. Create an exciting story and present it at Lions, Kiwanis, or other group meetings; they are always looking for guest speakers from the community.

Please do not say you are not allowed to do these things. In some cases that may be true, but it is more likely that someone before you just said you could not talk in public so that they would not have to do it. If you want to speak to others, ask your supervisors and directors.

As I close my final column, I challenge you to make a difference. If you are unsure how to act, email me and we can talk. If you have the ability to come to Spokane, Washington, this summer for the 2022 AEC, please do so. I promise there will be additional information on this topic and many others at the AEC.

We are in this profession and struggle together, be the difference!

Thank you.
Awareness of Business Owners and Environmental Health Officers Regarding Health Risks Associated With the Use of Water Mist Systems in Australia

Abstract  Water mist systems (WMS) are commonly used to cool public places, but they can be colonized by opportunistic premise plumbing pathogens (OPPPs) that cause infections in people with predisposing conditions. Adequate knowledge of health risks associated with these systems is important to avoid exposing people to OPPPs. In 2019, we conducted a questionnaire survey of 10 business owners who used WMS and 22 environmental health officers (EHOs) to assess their knowledge about the health risks of WMS. A majority of the owners (60%) and EHOs (77%) were not aware of the health risks. Only 50% of these business owners regularly maintained their systems, 60% used maintenance and cleaning schedules, and a high percentage (90%) had no training in the operation of the WMS. All EHOs surveyed reported that the installation and operation of WMS are unregulated.

Introduction  Water mist systems (WMS) are a cooling intervention used in public places. They achieve environmental cooling by releasing tiny water mists that absorb the latent heat of the ambient air. These systems form a component of premise plumbing, which is the part of a water distribution network installed downstream of the water meter and falling under the responsibility of property owners (Falkinham et al., 2015).

Water aerosols produced by WMS and similar misting systems can be <2.5 μm, making them respirable and able to reach the alveolar regions of the lungs where they can cause infections in people with compromised immune systems (Allegra et al., 2016). These misting systems can reduce the dry bulb air temperature by 8–12 °C (Farnham et al., 2015).

The potential of WMS to be colonized by opportunistic premise plumbing pathogens (OPPPs) has been demonstrated by previous research (Masaka et al., 2021). OPPPs are a group of microorganisms that have become adapted to surviving in premise plumbing networks and have been associated with some waterborne infections. Some common OPPPs include Legionella pneumophila, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Mycobacterium avium, Acanthamoeba, and Naegleria fowleri (Ashbolt, 2015; Aumeran et al., 2007).

WMS used as a cooling intervention in public places are outside the scope of the Health (Air-Handling and Water Systems) Amendment Regulations 2013, a Western Australian statute regulating similar systems. Most of these systems are not connected to central water treatment facilities (e.g., scheme water), therefore owners of WMS tend to use poor-quality water sourced from underground aquifers. These WMS are installed outdoors and above ground, resulting in water temperatures in the pipework being >20 °C (Agudelo-Vera et al., 2020), which is ideal for the growth of OPPPs.

The importance of knowledge, skills, and competence of operators has not been assessed. Falkinham et al. (2015) and Liu et al. (2019) have acknowledged the importance of knowledge and competence in managing the risk of OPPPs in premise plumbing. Guidelines dealing with the prevention of Legionella growth in similar features also include the importance of knowledge and competence in managing the risks of OPPPs (enHealth, 2015; Health and Safety Executive, 2014). A greater knowledge of OPPP risks in WMS can increase the competence of operators to manage them (Julien et al., 2020).

In this study, we investigated the knowledge and perceptions of environmental health officers (EHOs) and WMS owners working and operating in the northwestern part of Australia regarding the risk factors associated with OPPP growth. There is an increasing use of WMS in this region, a fact that can be attributed to their effectiveness in cooling ambient temperatures at a fraction of the costs associated with conventional air conditioning systems. Additionally, the climate in this region is characterized by temperature extremes during the summer season between the months of August and March (Australian Government...
Bureau of Meteorology, 2022), and is projected to become hotter due to climate change (Sudmeyer, 2016). Understanding the level of knowledge among owners of WMS about the health risks of WMS is important, as is understanding the knowledge level of EHOs who are responsible for ensuring public health safety from these environmental hazards.

Methods
We conducted a cross-sectional descriptive survey of WMS owners and EHOs in the northwestern part of Australia from 2018–2019. This study received prior approval from the Edith Cowan University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval #16337 MASAKA). We obtained written informed consent of all research participants before they participated in the study.

Study Population
The study population consisted of 10 owners of WMS and 27 EHOs working and operating in the northwestern part of Western Australia. The EHOs were drawn from a register of the North Western Environmental Health Group. Only those employed in local governments and working in nongovernmental organizations were included in this study. The sample of owners was drawn from a total of 15 who operate WMS in the study area and were willing to participate.

We used the Qualtrics sample size calculator (Smith, 2020) to determine the survey sample sizes for owners of WMS and for EHOs. The population size, a 5% margin of error, 95% confidence level, and a standard deviation of 0.5 were applied in calculating the sample sizes. An a priori sample size of 10 owners of WMS (100% of the eligible population size) and 27 EHOs was determined. All WMS owners surveyed responded to the questionnaire, but 22 of the 27 EHOs surveyed responded, giving a response rate of 100% and 81%, respectively. The five EHOs who did not respond later indicated by email that they had faced internet connection issues during the survey period; however, analysis of the data was already complete when they emailed the reasons for their nonresponse.

Survey Questionnaires
We developed two questionnaires, one for owners of WMS and one for EHOs, as tools to collect data. See the Supplemental Appendices at www.neha.org/supplemental for the two questionnaires.

The survey questionnaire for EHOs was developed based on the requirements of the Health and Safety Executive (2014) technical guidance on Legionnaires’ disease and the enHealth (2015) guidelines for Legionella control in the operation and maintenance of water systems in healthcare facilities and older adult care facilities. This questionnaire was structured and contained questions to gather information on the level of knowledge and perceptions on the associated health risks of WMS, regulatory and monitoring regimes, and design and operational aspects of WMS.

The questionnaire for WMS owners was developed based on the same criteria used for the EHO one, except that it excluded the section on regulatory and monitoring regimes, as this responsibility is not theirs.

Questionnaire Validation
We pilot tested both questionnaires with four owners of WMS and five EHOs based in the Northern Territory—a different geographical location with a similar climate to the northwestern part of Australia. We conducted the pilot tests to assess questionnaire feasibility in terms of the time it took to complete the questionnaire, the clarity of the questions, and the consistency of coding to ensure accurate result interpretation (García de Yébenes Prous et al., 2009).

A Kappa index score of 0.25 for the EHO questionnaire and 0.26 for the WMS owner questionnaire were calculated from the pilot test, demonstrating moderate reliability for both instruments (García de Yébenes Prous et al., 2009). Data from these pilot tests were not included in the final analysis.

Data Analysis
Data were analyzed using the Minitab version 18 statistical software package. Before analysis, the categorical variables were coded 1 or 0 to facilitate data analysis (Alkharusi, 2012). The Fisher’s exact test was used to measure association between variables because of its inability to be affected by small sample sizes (McDonald, 2014). A confidence level of 95% (0.05) was used to determine the significance of any association between variables. Results were presented as percentages, frequency tables, pie charts, bar graphs, and funnel graphs.

Results and Discussion
Owner Knowledge and Awareness of Health Risks for Water Mist Systems
A total of 10 WMS owners completed the questionnaire. For these 10 owners, 70% perceived that their systems are of public health significance; however, only 40% knew about the associated biological risks (Table 1). The

### Table 1: Perceived Health Risks and Public Health Importance of Water Mist Systems (WMS) by Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Answer</th>
<th>Owner Response (n = 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8: Perceived health risks of WMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High humidity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Public health importance of WMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Survey respondents were able to indicate multiple answers for question 8.
rest of the respondents did not respond to this follow-up question, perhaps because they did not know that WMS could be associated with health risks. The ability to comprehend specific health risks associated with these WMS requires individuals to have a basic level of knowledge and understanding to do so.

Most of the WMS owners who responded to the question regarding conditions that can promote the regrowth of OPPPs in WMS were knowledgeable about this public health issue, with 80% of respondents indicating poor maintenance, 70% selecting increased water temperature, and 70% selecting frequency of use as being the most significant conditions that promote microbial growth (Table 2). Although most of the respondents knew that poor maintenance could lead to OPPP growth in their WMS and were reasonably aware of the important activities necessary to avoid OPPP growth, only 50% reported carrying out regular maintenance of their systems according to manufacturer specifications.

Of the WMS owners, 90% reported that they had not received any training in the operation of the WMS and only 10% reported having undergone in-house training (Table 3). The reported inadequacy of training and regular maintenance of WMS is concerning considering the demonstrated importance of maintenance in managing OPPP growth in similar premise plumbing systems (Julien et al., 2020). Furthermore, the self-reported lack of competence in the safe operation of WMS could be a function of inadequate training or lack thereof (Figure 1). The absence of effective maintenance regimes for plumbing features that are capable of aerosolizing water was implicated in the largest legionellosis outbreak that occurred in Cumbria in the UK in 2002 (Bennett et al., 2014), as well as in a similar outbreak at the Melbourne Aquarium in Australia in 2000 (Greig et al., 2004).

**Environmental Health Officer Knowledge and Awareness of Health Risks for Water Mist Systems**

A total of 22 EHOs completed the questionnaire. Of the EHO respondents, 17 (77%) self-reported that they were unaware of the health risks associated with the use of WMS as a cooling intervention in public places. For specific health risks associated with WMS, several EHOs identified *Legionella* spp., amoeba, and *Pseudomonas* spp. as OPPPs that can regrow in WMS (Figure 2).

There was no observed difference in the level of knowledge about the health risks of WMS between WMS owners and EHOs ($p = .36$). The low level of knowledge among WMS owners and EHOs about the type of health risks and OPPPs that can colonize and regrow in WMS is concerning, especially considering the potential of widespread exposure.

---

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Answer</th>
<th>Owner Response ($n = 10$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10: Conditions promoting microbial growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased water temperature (25–50 °C)</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low carbon concentration</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (6.8–7.9)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofilms</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of use</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead legs</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor maintenance</td>
<td>8 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Maintenance frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Important maintenance aspects of WMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate disinfection</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage of residual water</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular flushing and cleaning</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of dead legs</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per manufacturer specifications</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtration of incoming water</td>
<td>8 (80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Survey respondents were able to indicate multiple answers for questions 10 and 12.

---

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Answer</th>
<th>Owner Response ($n = 10$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15: Training in WMS operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Type of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of people who patronize the public places that use WMS. The knowledge of health risks is a key driver of behavior change to take corrective measures to mitigate a health risk (Fan et al., 2018). To emphasize the importance of knowledge in managing the risk of Legionella in water systems, competence has been incorporated as a requirement in guidelines for the effective management of Legionella in water systems (enHealth, 2015; Health and Safety Executive, 2013).

**Type, Use, Operation, and Regulation of Water Mist Systems**

According to the WMS owner respondents, 50% of the systems are used as a cooling intervention in public places. Public places are captured under the Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911 of Western Australia as places where people gather for various purposes including entertainment and recreation. The installation and operation of WMS in public places constitute a risk to people who interact with contaminants released into the ambient air by these systems (enHealth, 2015); therefore, an investigation to understand the potential regrowth of OPPPs in WMS is necessary to assist in developing conceptual site models and controls (National Environment Protection Council, 2011).

Temperature reduction was reported by 70% of WMS owners and 76% of EHOs as the most common reason for using WMS, a difference that was not statistically significant ($p = .37$). This finding is not surprising considering the extreme temperatures experienced in the northwestern part of Australia (Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, 2022). The uptake of WMS is expected to increase due to the projected increase in mean maximum temperatures caused by climate change (Loechel et al., 2011; Sudmeyer, 2016).

The infrequent use of WMS results in water stagnation (Feazel et al., 2009). A total of 19 (86%) EHOs self-reported that WMS in their jurisdictions were operated seasonally in the summer. Only 2 (9%) EHOs reported frequent use of WMS (>4 hr/day) and 1 EHO (5%) reported infrequent use of WMS with no regular pattern. The infrequent use of WMS to cool ambient air in public places is consistent with the seasonal variation in this study area where mean summer temperatures often exceed 32 °C and the mean winter temperatures do not necessitate the use of WMS (Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, 2022). The difference in the reported frequency of use by EHOs was significantly different ($p = .01$). One study has shown a summer increase in temperature has been associated with the proliferation of L. pneumophila in premise plumbing (Brandsma et al., 2014). A different study, however, did not establish a seasonal variation.
in the occurrence of OPPPs in WMS (Masaka et al., 2021).

Almost all WMS owners (90%) indicated that the water used in their WMS was obtained from centrally managed water treatment plants. Conversely, 59% of EHOs indicated that both scheme and treated borehole water obtained from underground aquifers were used in WMS. This difference in responses was significant \( (p = .03) \) and could be attributed to a knowledge gap between the two groups. Water from underground aquifers can influence water chemistry by leaching mineral elements (Adabanija et al., 2020) that can promote biofilm formation and the regrowth of OPPPs (Ji et al., 2015).

The ability to release bioaerosols is one of the critical risk factors for any water system (Health and Safety Executive, 2013). The formation and release of tiny water mists are achieved by small nozzles that atomize the water under hydraulic or pneumatic pressure (Farnham et al., 2015). A total of 90% of WMS owners and 91% of EHOs reported that the WMS installed and operated in their areas use hydraulic nozzles, a difference that was not statistically significant \( (p = .10) \). A lack of maintenance of premise plumbing features has been implicated in several outbreaks of legionellosis where contaminated water mists were present (Haupt et al., 2012; Quinn et al., 2015).

Biofilm formation in premise plumbing systems can influence the regrowth of OPPPs in water systems (De Sotto et al., 2020). Of WMS owner respondents, 30% observed the growth of biofilms in their systems (Table 4). There was no association, however, between the respondent knowledge of biofilm formation (50%) and the ability to identify this phenomenon in WMS (30%; \( p = .65 \)). The ability to identify biofilms in WMS or similar features requires knowledge and skills of this phenomenon; however, the low level of knowledge and understanding observed among owners (Table 2) could have negatively affected this scenario.

The systematic use of cleaning and maintenance schedules is important in preventing OPPP growth in building water systems and cooling towers (ASTM International, 2016; New South Wales Ministry of Health, 2018; Rangel et al., 2011). Table 4 indicates that 60% of WMS owners do not use any cleaning and maintenance schedules, a result that could be related to the earlier finding shown in Table 2 where only 50% of owners carry out regular maintenance on their WMS. An insignificant association, however, between the failure to carry out regular maintenance and the lack of cleaning and maintenance schedules by WMS owners was determined \( (p = .10) \). A lack of maintenance of premise plumbing features has been implicated in some previous legionellosis outbreaks (Bennett et al., 2014; Greig et al., 2004).

Several governments have developed legislation, standards, and guidelines to effectively manage the public health risks posed by premise plumbing that can be colonized by OPPPs and that can then release contaminated bioaerosols into the environment. All EHO respondents reported that a licensing and approval system for WMS was not in place and that they did not inspect installed WMS as part of their public health regulatory activities (Table 5).

The absence of regulations for WMS is surprising considering that 23% of EHOs indicated that they received public complaints about WMS (Table 5). The Health and Safety Executive (2013) code to control *Legionella* bacteria is legally enforceable under health and safety legislation in the UK. Similarly, the Standards Australia (2011) standard is enforceable under Western Australia’s Health (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1911. The absence of a regulatory regime for WMS is due to the inadequacy of existing legislation and standards. Most of the existing legislation focuses on the prevention of legionellosis in older adult care facilities and hospitals, ignoring other settings where WMS can be colonized by OPPPs. The lack of focus on other emerging OPPPs, including *M. avium*, *Acanthamoeba*, and *N. fowleri*, is evident in the current guidelines.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Answer</th>
<th>Owner Response ((n = 10))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13: Biofilm formation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Cleaning and maintenance schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Answer</th>
<th>EHO Response ((n = 22))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10: Regulatory regime for WMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In place</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in place</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Public complaints of WMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints received</td>
<td>5 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No complaints received</td>
<td>17 (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations
The final sample sizes for the WMS owners (10) and EHOs (22) questionnaires were small, making it likely to lower the possibility of picking up a real effect (Button et al., 2013). To mitigate against this phenomenon, the F-statistic that is suitable for small sample sizes was used to evaluate any association between variables, which means that generalization of the study results should be done with caution. The novel nature of this research, however, makes the findings valuable and important to inform future research.

The self-reported data obtained using the survey questionnaires could not be validated for selective memory, telescoping, attribution, and exaggeration biases. Further research with larger sample sizes to enable statistical validation and generalization is recommended. The survey questionnaires, however, were pilot tested to identify this phenomenon and adjustments were made to the questionnaires prior to the participants being asked to complete them. These adjustments ensured that questions that would introduce recall of these biases were either replaced or amended (Althubaiti, 2016).

Conclusion
Our study indicated that the knowledge of health risks associated with the use of WMS is low among both business owners and EHOs. The absence of maintenance and cleaning schedules for WMS that are operated seasonally presents a significant risk for the colonization of these systems by OPPPs. Moreover, there is an absence of a regulatory regime to ensure the safe installation and operation of WMS. Additionally, the lack of formal training programs on the health risks associated with the use of WMS and the safe operation of WMS for business owners operating WMS needs to be addressed to improve owner competence and the ability to manage these risks.

Our findings should inform the review of existing legislation to include WMS considerations, the development of guidelines, and the development of training programs for business owners and EHOs. Furthermore, our results could have implications for designers of WMS in not only recreational sectors but also industrial sectors such as mining industries that use WMS for dust suppression.

Corresponding Author: Edmore Masaka, School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, 270 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup, Western Australia, 6027, Australia. Email: emasaka@ecu.edu.au.
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Community Outbreak of Legionellosis Associated With an Indoor Hot Tub, New Hampshire, 2018

Abstract Legionellosis is an infection acquired through inhalation of aerosolized water droplets containing Legionella bacteria. In August 2018, public health officials in New Hampshire launched an investigation into a legionellosis outbreak. They identified 49 illnesses likely associated with the outbreak and implicated an improperly maintained hot tub at a hotel. The same strain of Legionella pneumophila serogroup 1 was found in both the hot tub and in samples from two patients with Legionnaires’ disease. The indoor hot tub vented to the outdoors, which is how some patients with confirmed legionellosis likely acquired the infection despite not entering the hotel during the incubation period. This outbreak is notable for 1) likely illness acquisition through the exterior vent of the hot tub room and 2) use of whole genome sequencing to link environmental and patient specimens. Collaboration among public health and environmental officials, laboratorians, and building managers was essential to determining the source of the outbreak and preventing further illness.

Introduction Legionella bacteria are aerobic, Gram-negative, intracellular pathogens commonly found in fresh water and soil (Mercante & Winchell, 2015). Human infection typically is acquired through inhalation of Legionella-containing aerosols. Most infections are sporadic; however, outbreaks can occur and often are associated with exposure to aero- solized water from water systems in large facilities, such as those in hospitals, hotels, and apartment buildings, as well as hot tubs, decorative fountains, and cooling towers (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2021a).

The two major clinical syndromes caused by Legionella are Legionnaires’ disease and Pontiac fever. Legionnaires’ disease is characterized by fever, cough, shortness of breath, muscle aches, headaches, and pneumonia (CDC, 2021b). Symptoms develop 2 to 14 days following exposure and illness is often severe enough to require hospitalization. Risk factors for Legionnaires’ disease include older age, smoking, chronic respiratory disease, and other conditions that cause a person to be immunocompromised (World Health Organization, 2007). Due to its self-limited and nonspecific nature, Pontiac fever, an acute febrile illness, generally causes milder influenza-like illness without pneumonia within 72 hr of exposure and symptoms resolve without medical intervention (Glick et al., 1978).

There are at least 60 different species of Legionella bacteria; many are pathogenic but most disease (>90%) is caused by Legionella pneumophila (Lp) serogroup 1 (Lp1) (Yu et al., 2002). Diagnostic testing includes the urinary antigen test that detects only Lp1, culture of respiratory specimens, serological and antibody-based assays, and nucleic acid-based molecular diagnostics (Mercante & Winchell, 2015).

Reported cases of legionellosis in the U.S. have increased by more than 8-fold since 2000, with nearly 10,000 cases reported in 2018 (CDC, 2019a). This increase likely represents a true increase in frequency of disease that can be partially attributable to factors such as changing demographics, aging plumbing infrastructure, and environmental changes (CDC, 2019a).
changes—or could reflect increased detection secondary to improved diagnostic testing or disease reporting. From 2014–2018, an average of 42 cases of legionellosis were reported in New Hampshire each year; however, a 5-fold increase in legionellosis cases occurred over this time period, which is similar to national trends.

In August 2018, public health officials in New Hampshire became aware of a possible outbreak of legionellosis in a popular tourist destination. At the time, no legionellosis outbreaks had been identified in the state for more than two decades. The initial four individuals with confirmed Legionnaires’ disease were diagnosed within a 2-week period and reported overnight stays in a small geographic area, with two staying at the same hotel and two staying within four blocks of that hotel. This article a) describes epidemiologic, environmental, and laboratory investigations to identify the source of the outbreak and b) highlights the importance of public health collaboration to bring resources and expertise to quickly identify the source and prevent further transmission.

### Methods

All hospitals, healthcare professionals, laboratories, and specific other entities in New Hampshire are required by law to report both suspect and confirmed cases of legionellosis to the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) within 72 hr following diagnosis. Upon identification of the Legionnaires’ disease outbreak, we issued alerts to healthcare professionals, public health partners, neighboring state health departments, and the public in an effort to identify potential related illnesses and provide recommendations to prevent illness.

Our outbreak investigation pointed toward potential transmission at a hotel; therefore, prior guests of the hotel were notified and asked to report any illnesses. An “Epi-Aid” investigation was requested from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to assist with the environmental aspects of the investigation given their extensive expertise. We also partnered with the town’s health, safety, and fire officials to facilitate community investigations; New Hampshire Homeland Security and Emergency Management for logistical support; and the governor’s office to support interagency collaboration and coordinated public communications. This work was reviewed in accordance with CDC human research protection procedures and was determined to be nonresearch, public health response. Therefore, CDC institutional review board approval was not required.

All reported illnesses that were potentially related to the outbreak were investigated and categorized according to case definitions to determine likelihood of an illness being due to outbreak-associated legionellosis (Table 1). Persons with illnesses classified as a confirmed, probable, or suspect case of legionellosis were interviewed using a hypothesis-generating questionnaire that asked about more than 125 exposures. The onset of the outbreak was determined by looking for compatible illnesses within 4 weeks (two incubation periods) prior to onset of illness for the earliest identified case.

Because a common source of exposure (e.g., an overnight stay at the same hotel) was not identified among the initial cases, we conducted a comprehensive environmental investigation to identify potential community sources of Legionella aerosolization. We

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Laboratory Criteria</th>
<th>Clinical Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confirmed</strong></td>
<td>One of the following: A. Culture: Isolation of any <em>Legionella</em> organism from respiratory secretions, lung tissue, pleural fluid, or other normally sterile site. B. Urinary antigen testing: Detection of Lp serogroup 1 antigen in urine using validated reagents. C. Seroconversion: 4-fold or greater rise in specific serum antibody titer to specific species of <em>Legionella</em> or serogroups of Lp using validated reagents on specimens collected 3–6 weeks apart. D. Seroconversion: 4-fold or greater rise in antibody titer to multiple species of <em>Legionella</em> using pooled antigen and validated reagents. E. Direct fluorescent antibody (DFA) testing: Detection of specific <em>Legionella</em> antigen or staining of the organism in respiratory secretions, lung tissue, or pleural fluid by DFA staining, immunohistochemistry, or other similar method using validated reagents. F. Nucleic acid test: Detection of <em>Legionella</em> species by a validated nucleic acid assay.</td>
<td>Clinically or radiographically diagnosed pneumonia (LD) OR Fever AND one other symptom: chills, headache, myalgia, fatigue, malaise, cough (PF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probable</strong></td>
<td>Lack of a positive test result listed under the “confirmed” laboratory criteria. Includes persons not tested and those who tested negative.</td>
<td>Radiographically diagnosed pneumonia (LD) AND No alternative diagnosis that explains illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suspect</strong></td>
<td>Lack of a positive test result listed under the “confirmed” laboratory criteria. Includes persons not tested and those who tested negative.</td>
<td>Clinically diagnosed pneumonia (LD) OR Fever AND one other symptom: chills, headache, myalgia, fatigue, malaise, cough (PF) AND No alternative diagnosis that explains illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All case classifications required illness onset within 14 days of travel to the outbreak area. LD = Legionnaires’ disease; PF = Pontiac fever; Lp = Legionella pneumophila.*
reviewed aerial images, queried cooling tower industry professionals, reviewed water consumption records, and used a drone to look for cooling towers. We also canvassed the area on foot to look for possible sources of aerosolized warm water. Based on patient interviews or the environmental assessment, we visited establishments of potential interest to review water management practices, measure water source parameters (e.g., pH, free chlorine, temperature), and collect samples as indicated. We interviewed the workers responsible for operating and maintaining devices and premise plumbing systems; we also reviewed operation reports, log sheets, plans, and manufacturer product information sheets.

Environmental sampling for *Legionella* at possible exposure sites was performed per previously published protocols (CDC, 2019b), including collection of 1-L bulk water samples and swabs of plumbing fixtures and other environmental sources. We shipped the samples to CDC within 48 hr of collection for multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and culture testing according to established protocols (Benitez & Winchell, 2013; molecular inversion probe (MIP) sequencing for species confirmation; and whole genome sequencing (WGS) using the Illumina MiSeq instrument. Whole genome multilocus sequence typing (wgMLST) was used to analyze WGS (Raphael et al., 2016) and, where possible, sequence types (ST) were extracted from the genome sequences using sequence-based typing (SBT) (Gaia et al., 2005; Luck et al., 2013; Ratzow et al., 2007).

*Legionella* urinary antigen testing (UAT) was performed on patient specimens in clinical laboratories where patients sought care for symptoms that could have been caused by legionellosis. When possible, respiratory specimens were collected from patients who were symptomatic and UAT-positive; the specimens were sent to a public health laboratory for testing. Specimens collected during autopsy (e.g., fixed lung tissue) were sent directly to the CDC Infectious Diseases Pathology Branch (IDPB) for immunochromatographic and PCR assays for *Legionella* detection (Fiore et al., 1998). The genomic DNA extracted from the tissue was transferred to the CDC Pneumonia Response and Surveillance Laboratory, which used the extract for the multiplex PCR assay and nested SBT.

Specimens of sputum received by the New Hampshire Public Health Laboratories were cultured for *Legionella* and tested using the *Legionella* (direct) fluorescent antibody (DFA) test system (Scimedx). Clinical specimens underwent *Legionella* culture using BCYE + PAV (polymyxin B, anisomycin, and vancomycin) antibiotic supplementation (Remel). Culture plates were incubated at 35 °C for 14 days and inspected daily for growth. Colonies with morphology consistent with *Legionella* species were subcultured, and Gram staining and biochemical testing (e.g., hippurate and beta-lactamase) were performed to confirm genus-level identification.
Remaining specimens from clinical samples were shipped to CDC for multiplex PCR and culture analysis where any recovered *Legionella*-like organisms were identified to species level. Lp isolates that were not serogroup 1 were tested by slide agglutination and DFA to confirm serogroup. *Legionella* isolates that were not Lp species underwent MIP gene sequencing to determine species. WGS was conducted on Lp isolates; wgMLST was used to analyze WGS (Raphael et al., 2016) and, where possible, ST were extracted from the genome sequences using SBT (Gaia et al., 2005; Luck et al., 2013; Ratzow et al., 2007).

### Results

We identified a total of 49 ill persons during this investigation. Illness onset dates occurred between June 1 and September 6, 2018 (Figure 1). Among ill persons, ages ranged from 3 to 88 years and 24 (49%) identified as female. The 34 persons with confirmed or probable legionellosis, as well as 4 who met criteria for suspect legionellosis, exhibited symptoms compatible with Legionnaires’ disease; most of the 34 were hospitalized because of their illness. Two adult patients with laboratory-confirmed Legionnaire’s disease died, one of whom was over 65 years. The outbreak disproportionately affected visitors to New Hampshire, with 43 (88%) ill persons identified as residents of 5 other states and Canada. See Table 2 for additional information on characteristics of ill persons associated with this outbreak.

A total of 34 (69%) ill persons reported overnight stays at the same hotel in the 14 days prior to illness onset, with 17 (32%) reporting use of the hot tub, 21 (64%) reporting being in the hot tub room, and 24 (73%) reporting having taken a shower in a guest room. A total of 15 ill persons (31%) did not stay at the hotel, but reported being in proximity to the hotel, including 11 (73%) who reported walking by the hotel or visiting a nearby establishment within a few blocks of the hotel (Figure 2). The remaining four ill persons, including one who died, had incomplete interview information; therefore, their presence in the immediate vicinity could not be confirmed, though all were known to have been within approximately 0.5 mi (0.8 km) of the hotel. Besides the hotel, no other location identified with the potential for *Legionella* growth and aerosolization was visited by the majority of ill persons.

The implicated hotel where a majority of ill persons had overnight stays was a 4-story, 84-guest room facility that had been in operation for approximately three decades. The hotel parking lot was located along a heavily traveled one-way road that was adjacent to a main public parking lot for visitors to the area. Two boilers supplied hot water at the hotel and were observed to be set at 115 °F and 120 °F the day the investigation team visited the hotel. The hot water system did not recirculate, and hot water temperatures at points-of-use ranged from 101.7–108.1 °F, pH from 6.32–6.60, and free chlorine from 0.2–1.4 mg/l.

The hotel’s indoor hot tub was reported to have been in operation for at least 20 years. Upon initial notification of the first two persons with confirmed Legionnaires’ disease associated with the implicated hotel, the hotel was instructed to close the hot tub. Inspection of the hot tub identified significant safety concerns: the hot tub did not meet basic New Hampshire Department of
Environmental Services (DES) requirements (New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules, 2021) and did not have an operating permit issued by DES.

The oval-shaped hot tub measured 13 x 7 ft and had a volume of approximately 1,200 gallons. It was housed in a confined room not much larger than the hot tub itself. This room had a single ventilation duct that exhausted directly outside into the parking area next to an outdoor rinse station and seating. The hotel staff reported draining and cleaning the hot tub twice per week. There was no automatic or automated disinfection system, and no source of chlorine or bromine was identified on the premises. Available written records indicated that testing was conducted once every 2–4 days and that not all required test parameters were measured or recorded. A 12-month record to demonstrate daily monitoring prior to opening and every 4 hr during operation, as required by DES (New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules, 2021), was not available.

In total, 34 total bulk water \((n = 18)\) and swab \((n = 16)\) samples were collected from the hotel, including from guest room sinks and faucets \((n = 15)\), the hot tub \((n = 9)\), boilers and storage tanks \((n = 6)\), a fitness room adjacent to the hot tub room \((n = 2)\), and an outdoor hose at the rinse station used by guests \((n = 2)\). *Legionella* was detected by multiplex PCR in seven of nine hot tub samples; eight grew *Legionella*-like organisms on culture, including one that was negative by PCR. Some hot tub samples grew multiple *Legionella* species and/or serogroups.

*Legionella* spp. that grew from hot tub samples included Lp1, Lp serogroup 3 (Lp3), *L. dumoffii*, and *L. quinlivanii*. Among the 25 non-hot tub samples collected from the implicated hotel, *Legionella* spp. were detected in nine by PCR, including in samples taken from guest rooms, a boiler and storage tank, and the outdoor hose. One sample from a guest room shower grew Lp3. After receiving preliminary test results showing detection of *Legionella* by PCR in both the hotel hot tub and water distribution system, DHHS issued a public health order requiring the hotel to notify guests of the risk of Legionnaires’ disease, hire a contractor to remediate the water system, implement a water management plan, and conduct ongoing testing to ensure the building was remediated.

Other locations in the area were assessed and deemed unlikely to have caused the outbreak because they were not located where the majority of ill persons spent time or because the locations were not at increased risk for *Legionella* growth and transmission. There were no cooling towers identified within 1.5 mi (2.4 km) of the area.

Two outbreak-associated respiratory specimens sent to the New Hampshire Public Health Laboratories were shipped to CDC for additional testing. One specimen was collected from a patient with confirmed Legionnaires’ disease with an overnight stay at the implicated hotel who entered the hot tub room but did not use the hot tub; multiplex...
PCR identified Lp1 in this specimen and nested SBT indicated the isolate was ST94. The other outbreak-associated specimen was culture-negative and was collected from a patient with probable Legionnaires’ disease after a 10-day course of antibiotics.

A formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) lung tissue sample collected from a hotel guest during autopsy was submitted to the CDC Pneumonia Response and Surveillance Laboratory for additional testing. This laboratory verified the presence of Lp1 by multiplex PCR, which, according to the nested SBT analysis, belonged to ST94, the same ST identified in the respiratory specimen from one other patient and in the environmental isolates grown from some of the samples collected from the hotel hot tub. A total of five Lp3 isolates recovered from the hot tub formed another distinct clade. No Lp3 clinical isolates were identified for comparison.

**Discussion**

Our investigation into this community outbreak of legionellosis resulted in the identification of 34 persons with confirmed or probable Legionnaires’ disease and another 15 persons with nonspecific febrile illness or clinician-diagnosed pneumonia without laboratory or radiographic confirmation. The only common exposure among a majority of ill persons was an overnight stay at the same hotel; we were able to identify the same strain of Lp1 in both the hotel’s hot tub and in two patients with Legionnaires’ disease—indicating the hotel, and specifically the hot tub, was the primary source of this outbreak. The outbreak strain of Lp1 was not identified in any other samples collected from other locations during the investigation other than the hotel’s hot tub.

Inadequate maintenance of the hotel’s hot tub, as well as other conditions within the establishment, could have favored the growth of *Legionella* bacteria. *Legionella* were detected in nearly one half of the environmental samples collected at the hotel, with six hot tub samples growing the same strain of Lp1. While not confirmed through identification of *Legionella* and clinical-to-environment isolate comparison, the risk posed by the potable water system at the hotel is also concerning for possible transmission of legionellosis, especially given the significant diversity in *Legionella* species detected throughout the hotel water system.
Although not every person in this investigation reported direct contact with the hotel, travel by or around the hotel was common because of its location, and aerosolization of contaminated water from the indoor hot tub to the external environment is likely given the direct external powered ventilation unit that could have exposed additional persons passing by the hotel. We cannot completely exclude the possibility of a second source due to lack of clinical samples from patients who did not stay at the implicated hotel, but this scenario is less likely than a single point source, given the extensive investigation and lack of any other source being identified. Additionally, there were no new ill persons with legionellosis who reported exposure to the area after closure of the hot tub, lending further support that the hotel hot tub was the main source of the community outbreak.

In the U.S., Legionnaires’ disease tends to occur more frequently during the warmer months of summer and early fall (Shah et al., 2019), which is consistent with the increasing number of cases observed in this outbreak as the summer progressed. Most of the approximately 20 outbreaks of legionellosis reported each year in the U.S. are associated with buildings with complex or large water systems (CDC, 2016). Legionella grows best in stagnant water that is between 77 °F and 108 °F with insufficient levels of disinfectant (Katz & Hammel, 1987).

For disease transmission to occur, a mechanism to disperse the bacteria into the air is required, so the identified sources in most outbreaks include showers and faucets, hot tubs, decorative fountains, and cooling towers (CDC, 2016). It is unclear how far droplets containing Legionella could have traveled into the community through the hot tub room vent in this outbreak. In an outbreak in Spain, a small cooling tower located inside a building emitted aerosols outside through a vent located 6 ft above ground level (similar to the height of the hotel hot tub room’s vent in this outbreak) and was the source of 113 Legionella infections in a population of more than 28,000, including persons up to 0.5 mi (0.8 km) away (Sabria et al., 2006).

In general, even with thousands of individuals potentially exposed, the number who become ill in outbreaks is often small and dependent on a variety of factors (Fraser et al., 1977). In this outbreak, factors could have included whether the fan was actively operating or not, the concentration of Legionella in the hot tub room at the time, and individual characteristics of people such as age and immune system function. Because the people who presented as two of the initial cases did not stay overnight at the implicated hotel, we initially investigated the possibility that a cooling tower might have been the source of the outbreak. Outbreaks related to cooling towers typically involve transmission of aerosolized Legionella within 1 mi (1.6 km) from the cooling tower, although farther distances have been reported (Benowitz et al., 2018; Burckhardt et al., 2016; Rota et al., 2005; Sabria et al., 2006; Sala Ferré et al., 2009). During this investigation, we used aerial imagery and a drone to look for cooling towers within a 1.5-mi (2.4-km) radius from the area where cases were clustered, but no cooling towers were identified. There were cooling towers on buildings outside the 1.5-mile radius; however, the distribution of ill persons associated with this outbreak was tightly clustered, with over one half staying overnight at the implicated hotel, and therefore the epidemiology did not support transmission from a more distant cooling tower. Investigations into community legionellosis outbreaks consistently show a pattern of increased disease transmission closer to the source of the outbreak, with decreased transmission at farther distances (Sabria et al., 2006; Sala Ferré et al., 2009).

**Conclusion**

Epidemiologic, laboratory, and environmental assessment findings from this investigation indicated that an improperly maintained hot tub at a hotel was the primary source of this outbreak. Several factors likely contributed to the occurrence of the outbreak:

- The hotel did not have a water management program in place at the time of the outbreak, which could have contributed to conditions favoring Legionella growth.
- The water in the facility’s hot water tanks was kept at a temperature favorable for Legionella growth in the water distribution system.
- The hotel lacked a hot water return line, which would have resulted in increased water residency time as well as decreased temperature and disinfectant residual at point of use.
- The hotel did not have a permit issued by DES for operation of the hot tub for public use.
- The hot tub was not appropriately monitored and disinfected to prevent growth of Legionella.

Inadequate water treatment and residual disinfectant below the recommended levels is one of the most common contributing factors in hot tub-associated legionellosis outbreaks (Leoni et al., 2018). Buildings at increased risk of Legionella growth and transmission should have a water management program in place (ASHRAE, 2018). Additionally, if a public aquatic facility is present, property owners should follow proper maintenance and operation standards to ensure continuous good water quality (CDC, 2021c).

This outbreak demonstrates the importance of collaboration among public health and environmental officials, laboratorians, building managers, local town officials, and other government agencies. In this outbreak, collaboration was essential to quickly determining the outbreak’s source to prevent further community transmission. This collaborative approach was especially crucial given the complexity and thoroughness of the environmental investigation. The coordinated and rapid response of federal, state, and local officials prevented additional cases from occurring, which was demonstrated by cessation of the outbreak after closure of the hotel hot tub and remediation of the building’s water system.

Adherence to public bathing regulations and following an appropriate water management program to reduce the risk of legionellosis is essential and could have potentially prevented this outbreak.
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**Healthcare Visits and Summertime Heat Index in Virginia: An Analysis of Syndromic Surveillance Data Collected From 2015–2020**

**Abstract** Current syndromic surveillance systems can track changes in heat-related illness (HRI) and overall healthcare utilization in real time to provide situational awareness. Retrospective analyses of emergency department and urgent care visits collected via syndromic surveillance data can be used to assess overall contributions of ambient conditions on healthcare utilization. Using distributed lag nonlinear models, syndromic surveillance data from participating facilities in Virginia were analyzed to determine exposure–response relationships using four different meteorological metrics for assessing heat stress. All-cause healthcare visits start to increase at 26 °C (79 °F) maximum daily heat index, whereas HRI visits start to increase at 30 °C (86 °F), with an estimated 6% of healthcare visits attributable to ambient heat during the summer months in Virginia. Results from this study can be used to develop targeted public health messaging when ambient conditions are expected to increase healthcare visits.

**Introduction**

Each year there are more than 65,000 emergency department visits and 9,235 hospitalizations identified as heat-related illnesses (HRIs) in the U.S. (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022). HRIs range from rashes and cramps to heat exhaustion and heat stroke (World Health Organization, 2011). During the 2021 record-breaking heat in Oregon and Washington, heat-related emergency department visits were 69 times higher than during the same period in 2019 (Schramm et al., 2021).

Beyond HRI, evidence shows there are associations between high outdoor temperatures and other adverse health outcomes, resulting in increased hospital admissions, emergency department visits, and ambulance requests (Gronlund et al., 2014). Additionally, Gronlund et al. (2014) found that extreme heat is associated with increased hospital admissions, especially for renal diseases (15%, 95% confidence interval [CI] [9, 21]) and respiratory diseases (4%; 95% CI [2, 7]) among older adults in the U.S. Moreover, Anderson et al. (2013) found that for every 10 °F increase in temperature on the same day, the hospital admission rate for respiratory issues increases on average by 4% over 213 counties in the U.S.

While infrastructure improvements and higher prevalence of air conditioning mitigated HRI in the latter part of the 20th century, evidence suggests that risk of heat-related morbidity and mortality is now increasing due to climate change (Bobb et al., 2014; Davis et al., 2003; Lay et al., 2018). An estimated 37% of the burden of heat-related mortality between 1991 and 2018 is attributable to recent climate change (Vicedo-Cabrera et al., 2021). A study of 12 major U.S. cities projected that there would be approximately 200,000 heat-related deaths by the end of the 21st century due to increasing temperatures, even after accounting for increased human resiliency to extreme heat (Petkova et al., 2014). Global estimates suggest that the increasing excess deaths due to extreme heat add significantly to overall estimates of economic damages of climate change (Bressler, 2021). Therefore, protecting the public from HRIs and deaths is important and urgent.

Emergency department and urgent care visit data gathered via syndromic surveillance systems have been used to estimate increases in visits expected as temperature or heat index increases during summer months. For example, in North Carolina from 2008–2011, there was an average of 15.8 more daily emergency department visits for every 1 °F increase in daily maximum temperature from 98–100 °F (Rhea et al., 2012). Researchers from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have provided analysis strategies for determining heat index ranges in which the highest attributable fractions of hospitalizations would be expected (Vaidyanathan et al., 2019).

We applied the CDC analytic framework to over 12 million records collected via syndromic surveillance from Virginia emergency departments and urgent care facilities (referred collectively to as healthcare facilities herein) from May–September in 2015 to 2020. Our study aimed to 1) develop exposure–response associations for all-cause and HRI healthcare visits, 2) compare the predictive value of alternative exposure measures that...
incorporate solar radiation and wind speed in addition to temperature and humidity, and 3) estimate when heat-attributable healthcare visits are most burdensome in Virginia.

Methods

Healthcare Visit Data Acquisition and Processing

Daily all-cause visits and HRI visits to 185 healthcare facilities are reported to the Virginia syndromic surveillance system (105 emergency departments [hospital-based and free-standing] and 80 urgent care centers) and maintained by the Virginia Department of Health. An HRI visit was defined using the syndromic surveillance case definition developed by the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (2016). The definition captures visits with a chief complaint or discharge diagnosis medical billing code indicating heat exposure, heat cramps, heat exhaustion, or heat stroke. Analyses were limited to those visits occurring between May 1 and September 30 in 2015 to 2020.

Patient-reported home U.S. Postal Service ZIP Code and facility location ZIP Code were used to develop two data sets for geolocating daily visits. Of the 1,275 ZIP Codes in Virginia, 136 (10.7%) had reported healthcare facilities between May and September, 2015–2020. Only patients who reported Virginia home ZIP Codes were included in the patient ZIP Code level analysis, whereas patients who reported home ZIP Codes outside of Virginia, but visited a Virginia facility, were included in the facility ZIP Code level analysis.

Meteorological Data Processing

Daily mean/minimum/maximum air temperature (°C), daily mean specific humidity (kg/kg), daily mean of shortwave radiation flux downward (surface; W/m²), daily mean surface pressure (Pa), and daily mean of 10-m above ground zonal wind speed (m/s) were downloaded from the North American Land Data Assimilation System (NLDAS) Primary Forcing Data L4 Hourly 0.125 x 0.125 degree V002 (NLDAS_FORA0125_H) for dates matching healthcare visit data from May 1–September 30, 2015–2020 (Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center, 2022).

These data were further processed to obtain daily values for ZIP Code tabulation areas (ZCTA) as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau (2021). We calculated the environmental measurement values for each ZCTA by using overlap weights. For instance, if NLDAS2 Grid A has a 30% overlapping area with the ZCTA and NLDAS2 Grid B has a 70% overlapping area with the same ZCTA, the mean temperature of this ZCTA equals the mean temperature of Grid A × 30% + mean temperature of Grid B × 70%. The meteorological variables were estimated for each of the 896 ZCTAs in Virginia.

Furthermore, relative humidity (%) was needed to calculate heat index (HI), wet bulb globe temperature (WBGT), and universal thermal climate index (UTCI); however, only specific humidity (kg/kg) is provided in NLDAS. Relative humidity (RH) was calculated from specific humidity (kg), surface pressure (hPa), and air temperature (°C) using the “qair2rh” function from the “metutils” package in R (GitHub, Inc., 2019). The conversion was further checked in random samples by using the online Relative Humidity Calculator (Rotronic Instrument Corp., n.d.), where consistent results were obtained. The 2-m wind speed was estimated from 10-m zonal and meridional wind speeds. The adjustment of wind speed to 2-m above ground was based on the equation from Allen et al. (1998). Daily mean/minimum/maximum HI (°C) was calculated from daily mean/minimum/maximum temperature (°C) and RH (%), respectively.

WBGT was calculated using the method by Liljegren et al. (2008). WBGT (°C) and UTCI (°C) were calculated from air temperature (°C), RH (%), wind speed (m/s), and solar radiation (W/m²) using the Excel Heat Stress Calculator provided by ClimateCHIP (2022).

Exposure Assignment for Healthcare Visits

ZIP Codes reported in the healthcare visit data were matched to weather data estimated at ZCTAs. A total of 379 of 1,275 (30%) ZIP Codes did not have a direct ZCTA match. Of those, 327 (86%) ZIP Codes were matched to ZCTA by using the ZIP Code-to-ZCTA crosswalk file (UDS Mapper, 2022). The remaining unmatched ZIP Codes (n = 52) were manually searched and replaced using the nearest ZIP Code with a matching ZCTA (United States Zip Codes, 2022). See the Supplemental Tables at www.neha.org/supplemental for the ZIP Code-to-ZCTA match list.

Statistical Analysis

We ran Poisson or zero-truncated negative binomial distributed lag nonlinear regression models to determine exposure–response relationships:

\[
\text{Log(E(y_{it})) = } \alpha + s(x_{it}; \theta) + DOW_{i} + \text{factor(year)} + \text{ns(DOY, df = 4)} + \text{Holiday} + \text{Health region zone} + (1|\text{ZCTA})
\]

where \(y_{it}\) is the number of healthcare visits on day \(t\) and within ZCTA \(i\). The cross-basis term of a single weather predictor \(s(x_{it}; \theta)\) is a bidimensional function \(s\) and coefficient \(\theta\), which defines an exposure-lag-response risk surface accounting for 2 days of lag. Daily maximum/mean heat index, WBGT, or UTCI were applied separately as the ambient weather predictor. Additionally, model Akaike information criterion was used to compare model fits using the different predictors. DOW is day of week; DOY is day of year; and holidays included Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Labor Day during the study period.

When the facility ZIP Code is used for location and exposure estimation in the analysis, all 139 ZIP Codes with a facility had at least one visit on each day of the study period; a distributed lag nonlinear model (DLNM) assuming a Poisson distribution was utilized. In the analysis using patient ZIP Code as the unit of analysis and for exposure estimation, 1,256 of the 1,275 ZIP Codes in Virginia had at least one healthcare visit in the study period. Zero-truncated negative binomial regression was utilized in this analysis as 489,255 out of 1,170,450 (41.8%) patient ZIP Code-days had zero healthcare visits. We followed the methods by Xu et al. (2018) to run a zero-truncated negative binomial DLNM. In the zero portion of the model, healthcare visits were converted to binary outcomes (1 indicates ≥1 visit, 0 indicates no visit), and DLNM was run using binomial family and logit link. In the non-zero portion, only ZIP Code-days with healthcare visits ≥1 were included, and DLNM was run using Poisson family and log link.

In addition to examining exposure–response relationships with total healthcare visits, we also examined exposure–response relationships using HRI healthcare visits as a proportion of total visits as the outcome variable. The statistical analysis followed as above, with the inclusion of all health-
care visits as an offset term and aggregating ZIP Code-days to health region-days, as the majority of ZIP Code-days had zero HRI visits. There are five health regions in Virginia (Virginia Department of Health, 2007).

Following the methods of Vaidyanathan et al. (2019), in each model, a minimal morbidity weather metric value between the 25th and 75th percentile was determined. Attributable numbers and attributable fractions (%) were estimated using the minimal morbidity heat metric as the baseline, and a weather metric range (5 °C interval) with the highest attributable fraction (%) was identified. Models were stratified by month to determine differences in exposure–response in early summer when it is expected fewer people are acclimated to hot weather compared with later in the summer.

All statistical analyses were performed with R version 4.0.2 using the DLNM package (Gasparrini, 2011; Gasparrini et al., 2010; Gasparrini & Leone, 2014; Tobias et al., 2017). This study was considered exempt by Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (IRB protocol #21-041) and Virginia Department of Health IRB (Study #50237).

Results
There were 12,091,599 healthcare visits at Virginia facilities reported to the Virginia Department of Health syndromic surveillance system between May and September in 2015 to 2020, with 14,041 (0.12%) of those visits classified as an HRI. When we limited visits to Virginia patient ZIP Codes, there were 12,577 HRI healthcare visits out of 11,474,069 total visits. Summary statistics of all-cause healthcare visits start to increase by month suggests lower heat indices compared with later in the summer.

In the study period, the mean daily maximum HI (MaxHI) was 31.9 °C, mean HI (MeanHI) was 23.7 °C, mean WBG (MeanWBG) was 22.9 °C, and mean UTCI (MeanUTCI) was 22.8 °C per ZIP Code-days (Table 1). The correlation between meteorological metrics ranged from 0.84 (MeanWBG and MeanHI) to 0.96 (MeanWBG and MeanUTCI) and are presented in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

In our evaluation of the four weather metrics (MeanHI, MaxHI, WBG, and UTCI), we found that daily mean WBG—which incorporates solar radiation and wind speed in addition to temperature and humidity—and MaxHI provided the best fit across models (Table 2). Because WBG is less familiar, we have summarized exposure–response results using MaxHI as the exposure metric below.

All-cause healthcare visits start to increase at 26 °C (79 °F) MaxHI (Figure 1A and C, Table 3), whereas HRI visits start to increase at 30 °C (86 °F) MaxHI and rise steeply thereafter (Figure 1B and D). Most healthcare visits attributable to extreme heat occur on days between 35–40 °C (95–104 °F) MaxHI.

The patient or facility ZIP Code models suggest that on average over the 6 years, between 113,549 and 135,280 visits per year are attributable to high HI, which is between 6–7% of total visits during May to September (Table 3). We calculated this attributable number of visits by applying the risk ratio at a given maximum HI (Figure 1A and B) to each day that is above the minimum morbidity MaxHI (Table 3), within the time period of the study (May–September, 2015–2020), then divided by 6 to obtain a yearly average.

Variation in exposure–response relationships by month suggests lower heat indices trigger increases in healthcare visits in early summer compared with in later summer (Table 4). For example, the minimum morbidity MaxHI is estimated at 20 °C (68 °F) in
May, increasing to 25 °C (77 °F) in June. The 5 °C range of MaxHI that has the most heat-attributable visits also increases over the summer months, starting at 25–30 °C (77–86 °F) in May and increasing to 43–50 °C (113–122 °F) in July. August has the highest number and fraction of heat-attributable healthcare visits, accounting for 20% of the total heat-attributable visits between 2015–2020 in Virginia (131,594 of 681,291 total).

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Our study presents a methodology for utilization of state-level syndromic surveillance data to optimize heat warning messaging based on expected changes in healthcare visits given a set of meteorological variables. The presented results for Virginia suggest public health messaging around heat indices during summertime should be triggered when days are forecasted to reach a maximum HI above 25 °C (77 °F) in May and 35 °C (95 °F) in June, July, and August. Virginia facilities should expect significant increases in healthcare visits when daily max heat indices rise above 35 °C (95 °F). Our findings are consistent with previous analyses in Virginia in Charlottesville and the Roanoke region, which found between a 6–7% elevation of emergency department hospital admissions between 2005 and 2016 in Charlottesville and between 2010 and 2017 in the Roanoke region when apparent temperature exceeded 35 °C (95 °F) or 33 °C (91 °F) for at least 3 days, respectively (Davis et al., 2020; Davis & Novicoff, 2018).

Our results are also consistent with a national-level analysis that suggested hospitalizations, particularly for renal failure and fluid and electrolyte disorders, for the Southeast region of the U.S. started to increase at 86 °F, which is well below the median (106 °F) and
range (101–112 °F) of HIs previously used for issuing heat alerts in Virginia (Vaidyanathan et al., 2019). We found that overall exposure–response relationships are similar when using meteorological variables from facility ZIP Code or patient ZIP Code analysis models, suggesting that the simpler facility-level analysis could be sufficient to determine thresholds for expected increases in healthcare visits and to monitor patterns in real time within syndromic surveillance systems.

Limitations of the current analysis include potential coincident exposures that are not accounted for in the analysis, such as air pollution. Previous research suggests that for urban areas, health outcomes associated with extreme heat events might be partially mediated via increases in air pollution, particularly ozone (Anenberg et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2017). Potential exposure misclassification is another limitation of the study design. Facility ZIP Code analysis allowed for inclusion of records from patients with non-Virginia addresses (11.5 million versus 12.1 million total records in analysis); however, some patients could have traveled substantial distances to a facility from where the exposure occurred, potentially increasing exposure misclassification when using meteorological variables at facility ZIP Codes. Additionally, variability in chief complaint text entry across facilities could have influenced designation of HRI visits in our analysis, and not all facilities in Virginia participate in syndromic surveillance data reporting.

Currently, some syndromic surveillance systems (e.g., the Electronic Surveillance System for the Early Notification of Community-Based Epidemics [ESSENCE] within the National Syndromic Surveillance Program) include temperature and humidity weather station variables that could be used to calculate maximum heat index, providing a method for real-time and continuous monitoring. Our results using facility meteorological variables suggest that WBGT might be a better predictor of healthcare visits compared with other metrics. This finding is consistent with a large body of research showing WBGT is a more accurate ambient metric of meteorological conditions that induce physiological heat stress (Wolf et al., 2021); however, the additional variables of solar radiation and wind speed are not available currently.

### TABLE 3
Model Result Summary for Healthcare Visits Attributable to Nonoptimal Daily Maximum Heat Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Minimum Morbidity Daily Maximum Heat Index</th>
<th>Average Attributable Number of Healthcare Visits/Year</th>
<th>Overall Attributable Fraction %</th>
<th>95% CI °C °F</th>
<th>Daily Maximum Heat Index Range With Peak Attributable Fraction °C °F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient ZIP Code</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>135,280</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>35–40</td>
<td>95–104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility ZIP Code</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>135,280</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>35–40</td>
<td>95–104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CI = confidence interval.

### TABLE 4
Model Result Summary for Healthcare Visits Attributable to Nonoptimal Maximum Heat Index Stratified by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Minimum Morbidity Daily Maximum Heat Index</th>
<th>Overall Attributable Number</th>
<th>Overall Attributable Fraction %</th>
<th>95% CI °C °F</th>
<th>Daily Maximum Heat Index Range With Peak Attributable Fraction °C °F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64,537</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>[0.03, 3.01]</td>
<td>25–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86,512</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>[0.04, 4.06]</td>
<td>35–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91,578</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>[0.04, 4.22]</td>
<td>45–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>131,594</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>[0.06, 5.92]</td>
<td>35–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90,132</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>[0.04, 4.06]</td>
<td>30–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May–September</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>681,291</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>[0.06, 6.04]</td>
<td>35–40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CI = confidence interval.
from weather station data imported into the ESSENCE system. Advancements in provision of near real-time remotely sensed gridded products could alleviate this current data gap (Heo et al., 2019). Next steps could include evaluation of regional differences in relationships and further delineation of the meteorological variables with high explanatory power.

In conclusion, coupling gridded meteorological variables with syndromic surveillance data can be used to determine U.S. state-specific ambient condition thresholds that are expected to increase healthcare visits during the summer months. The resultant exposure–response relationships allow for targeted messaging to the public and healthcare facilities, as well as provision of mitigation resources when and where needed.
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The Douglas County Health Department in Omaha, Nebraska, is hiring!
Omaha offers a big city experience with neighboring rural beauty.

Full time position open for **Supervisor of Environmental Health**

Apply at [https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/douglas](https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/douglas)

Applications accepted until July 9, 2022 • Douglas County is an EOE - Disability/Veterans

---

**Funding Available for Your Food Safety Program**

Apply for the NEHA-FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model Grant Program this summer. This program offers a tremendous opportunity to enhance your retail food safety program through alignment with the Retail Program Standards.

- Achieve conformance with Retail Program Standards
- Identify gaps to focus resources
- Foster growth for your team

The Grant Portal will open this August for 2023 grants, offering 1-year development base grants and optional add-on grants for mentorship, training, and special projects.

Questions?
Contact the **NEHA-FDA RFFM Grant Program Support Team** at retailgrants@neha.org or toll-free at 1-833-575-2404.

Visit our Retail Grants webpage for the latest information, resources, and training at [www.neha.org/retailgrants](http://www.neha.org/retailgrants).
Through university classes, career development, or on-the-job training, most readers have a sense of GIS (geographic information systems) and what they can do. In my experience, environmental health does not ask enough of GIS.

**What Is GIS?**

It is incorrect to think of GIS as only Google Maps, making us aware of nearby restaurants and driving directions. It is superficial to think of GIS as only beautiful and colorful maps that dramatically highlight clusters of food facilities or inspector district boundaries.

GIS is a collection of data, software, and people that maintains, collects, and analyzes data that often have a geospatial component. When you see the word “geospatial,” that means a place on Earth. Everything done in environmental health relates to a place on Earth.

The impact of GIS is far-reaching. In fact, it is universal, although often behind the scenes, informing policy and optimizing operations. And the result of it all is not a map you can look at.

Recall that the component parts are data, software, and people.

Consider this classic GIS example from one of my GIS instructors who described how a well-known chain of corporate coffee shops chooses a new store location. Naturally, the coffee chain wants a location that maximizes profit.

**First, the Data**

They begin with data from the corporation itself. How many customers does a comparable store serve? During what times of day do sales surge? What products are popular (and profitable)? What distance and how many turns? And yes, we are counting the number of turns to get your morning coffee. Not surprisingly, these data come from the convenient ordering app, rewards program, and point-of-sale systems from the coffee shop.

They add commercially available information about homes and businesses in the region, income, family makeup, traffic patterns, and coffee chain alternatives (i.e., the competition). They likely factor in zoning and master plans from the city.

They might add information about their own supply chain (i.e., how convenient and cost-effective it is to deliver supplies from regional distribution centers). Weather patterns can also play a role, including whether the outdoor seating receives sunlight or shade.

Finally, they add data about available real estate and the likely terms (e.g., cost, improvements required, etc.).

**Next, the Software**

The dominant software provider is ESRI (although there are other options used much less frequently). They have multiple related products with each doing something different.

**Finally, the People**

A trained GIS analyst or GIS specialist, perhaps a business analyst, is put on the job. Their job is to configure the data, build and validate a model, and produce recommendations along with projections. The model is used over and over for each new site.
One can see how the vast number of variables and geospatial elements make the problem a difficult one to get your head around. No human could do it. Yet, GIS performs these tasks all the time.

The State of GIS in Environmental Health

No GIS for Environmental Health
There are plenty of cases where a health district does not have its own GIS. The data exist, often with county GIS, but it is not obvious how to gain access.

Or, in some cases, the agency’s data management system does not support GIS.

Project-Based GIS for Environmental Health
In many more departments, the need for GIS comes in fits and starts. That is, a project is proposed, the GIS is engaged, data are exported, and a one-time analysis is produced. The project ends until the next cycle. This process can still work even if the agency’s data management system does not support GIS.

Always Available GIS Services
This format is most common and very doable. As the agency manages its inventory and provides services, its data system captures the location along with the transaction. GIS services can easily validate addresses, thus ensuring accurate routing and mail delivery.

Most often, location is established by geocoding (i.e., estimating location) based on address. Sometimes the field staff carry GPS receivers capable of establishing a pinpoint location, such as the location of an onsite wastewater treatment system or water well, via satellite.

Truly Integrated GIS-Based Decision Making
When local and state environmental health begins to achieve fully integrated GIS, the data (e.g., county, third-party, agency’s own inventory and services), software, and people can maintain a system where GIS is always present and factored into most decision making.

For example, GIS should inform inspector routing based on variables like fuel consumption, estimated emissions, travel time, and facility risk. The tradition of slicing cities into inspector districts would be dynamically leveled according to the ebb and flow of inventory and should immediately flex when, for example, a position remains vacant for one week or more.

Closing Thoughts
The best advice I could offer is to find your GIS department and make that contact. If you are part of a health district, that could mean reaching out to one or more counties because that is likely where the relevant GIS data live. The same challenge, although larger, exists for state health departments. The good news is that most GIS leaders are eager to see their systems be used in meaningful ways. And the modern systems are built to accommodate a “federated model,” which means that the data are supposed to span departments or organizations with little friction.

Next, I advise you to come to that first meeting with some needs already in mind. Be pragmatic with a proposal that is not open-ended. You can ask to brainstorm but work toward a deliverable that is well defined.

Finally, if prompted (or tempted) to install your most tech-savvy inspector as an in-house GIS guru, resist. There is a place for embedded GIS experts in large enough agencies, but the skillset is specific and not easily picked up by self-study.

Happy mapping!

Corresponding Author: Darryl Booth, General Manager, Environmental Health, Accela, 2633 Camino Ramon #500, San Ramon, CA 94583. E-mail: dbooth@accela.com.
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Plastics are a group of useful chemicals that have increased in usage since the 1950s (Miranda et al., 2020). Plastics are stable regarding both temperature resistance and chemical interactivity. Due to these properties, plastics are utilized in a variety of health products such as toothbrushes, break-resistant beverage containers, and intravenous tubing. Although plastics are extremely useful, they also break down in the environment and present a source of exposure to humans in the form of microplastics. A microplastic is commonly defined as a plastic with any dimension <5 µm (Güven et al., 2017; Stapleton, 2019). Researchers have defined a smaller group of plastics as nanoparticles with a size range from 1 to 1,000 nm (Gigault et al., 2018). Here we will retain the term microplastics to include all plastic particles <5 µm.

To address the emerging public health concerns for exposure to microplastics, an interdisciplinary working group was formed, combining staff from the National Center for Environmental Health (NCEH) and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). NCEH has taken the lead on investigating microplastics in drinking water. This work is consistent with its other efforts to provide safe water support to local and state health departments to address risks to human health. ATSDR has evaluated whether exposures to microplastics in the environment are hazardous in alignment with its mandate to evaluate potential health effects of hazardous substances in the environment.

The NCEH/ATSDR microplastics working group has organized the literature on microplastics to understand and characterize human risk and exposure from microplastics. The group has identified major data gaps related to exposure to microplastics in air and water (Zarus, 2020), reviewed efforts to evaluate occupational exposures to microplastics (Zarus, Zare-Bermudez, et al. 2020), and provided an overview of the transport of microplastics in the environment (Carroll et al., 2020). The group is also developing standardized methods for sample collection and biomonitoring (Muianga et al., 2021; Zarus, Muianga, et al., 2020). The workgroup is currently involved in a series of additional reviews to address various public health issues, three of which are underway. This column is a summary of six of the reviews, grouped according to the following criteria: exposure, effects, and data gaps.

**Literature Reviews**

The microplastics working group conducted a series of literature searches during 2019–2022 on any topic related to microplastics. Thousands of articles were identified. Figure 1 shows a time series of published literature from 2010–2019. Most published literature occurred after 2015. Team members were assigned a group of documents to review. A scoping review orga-
nized the literature into three broad categories: environmental, adsorption and absorption, and human exposure toxicology and health. Much of the published literature was related to the environment. Figure 2 shows the results of one reviewer (Webb et al., 2021). Publications most frequently addressed questions related to microplastics in water more than any other environmental media, which was consistent with all staff reviews. The higher focus on water is consistent with the early availability of sampling methodologies in water for ecologic purposes (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2013). These methods were applied to study ocean plastics and then to study plastics in fish, which left many questions regarding public health implications for fish consumption.

**Quantifying Human Exposure**

ATSDR (2022) applied its health assessment process to published environmental data to estimate human exposures (Zarus, Muianga, et al., 2021). This assessment included human exposure via three main routes: ingestion, inhalation, and absorption. ATSDR applied relevant human ingestion and inhalation rates to calculate exposure rates. Microplastics in seafoods could amount to thousands of microparticle particles ingested per day. Although exposures to the microplastics measured in water, air, and food additives appeared to be much less than in seafood, the sampling methods limited the size of microplastics able to be detected in those media. Packaging, as with plastic tea bags, appeared to increase microplastic exposure, but packaging studies used different analytical methods than those used for most foods. Table 1 summarizes the published environmental microplastic data to assess human exposures. The data gaps identified in the exposure media were used to inform a workshop and follow-up work involving international scientists (Zarus, Casillas, et al., 2021).

**Assessing Effects of Human Exposure**

Reviews showed target organs and systems that microplastics can affect, including the immune system, respiratory system, hepatic system, and gastrointestinal (GI) tract (Zarus, Muianga, et al., 2021; Zarus, Zarate-Bermudez, et al., 2020). Importantly, ATSDR found that documented clinical effects were not associated with the term “microplastics” but rather exposure to specific synthetic substances.

Direct exposure to microplastics resulted in lung effects in animals and, because of occupational exposures, in humans. Immune system effects included polyethylene translocating in the lymph system from implants and a foreign body response. Neurologic system effects included polystyrene affecting neurologic mouse cells and polyethylene associated with human dopamine levels. Microplastics were detected in the GI tracts and feces of environmentally exposed individuals and worker studies identified GI health effects. Studies of the hepatic system included an associated health effect in workers. Table 2 summarizes data and data gaps germane to human exposures to microplastics and associated effects. While exposures to many populations are demonstrated, clear clinical effects were only observed in workers or patients with plastic implants. Many data gaps exist relating animal studies to human exposures.

**Identifying Critical Data Gaps**

Although microplastic literature heavily favored an environmental focus, data gaps remain within that arena. Very few studies examine the most bioavailable plastics—those plastics smaller than 10 µm (Table 1). Methods in the marine environment, while more standardized than other media, lack inclusion of the smaller particles that can move within cells. Other environmental media lack method standardization. Additionally, few studies define how microplastics behave in the atmosphere and in the sediment. ATSDR identified several pressing data gaps related to identifying microplastics exposure and toxicity to humans. A general list of the data gaps that need to be addressed to form a more complete picture of microplastics toxicity and exposure to humans is available in Table 2.

In December 2021, ATSDR led a session to address some of the health-related data gaps within the Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation Workshop on Nanoplastics in Marine Debris (Zarus, Casillas, et al., 2021). During this session, presenters provided new data identifying unique effects of polystyrene,
polyvinyl chloride, and acrylic on lung cells, and a means to assess the effects of microplastic exposures (Goodman et al., 2021; Mahadevan & Valiyaveettil, 2021; Mumtaz & Gehle, 2021). The direct cell dosing studies cannot be used to assess human health implications because they incompletely characterize human exposures. They do suggest, however, a need for follow-up studies. A current review at ATSDR is providing a statistical analysis of the data in Table 2 to assist in prioritizing the data needs.

**Conclusion**
The study of microplastics is relatively new, with researchers quickly responding to the published data gaps. ATSDR and NCEH are conducting scoping reviews on thousands of published research studies on microplastics. The lack of microplastic-specific information before 2015 does not exclude the important work that had been conducted prior to 2015, as prior to that date much work was conducted on specific plastic substances such as nylon, polyethylene, polyvinyl chloride, etc.

General conclusions that can be made now include the following:

- Most microplastics research has been focused on the environment, specifically that of oceans, lakes, and rivers.
- Most people are exposed to microplastics in air, water, and foods.
- Some microplastics translocate within our bodies.
- Some microplastics carry other pollutants.
- Clear clinical effects have only been demonstrated in occupational settings.
- Cell studies that find unique effects currently cannot be applied to understand environmental exposures.

_Corresponding Author:_ Gregory M. Zarus, Director, Office of Innovation and Analytics, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, 4770 Buford Highway NE, MS S102-2, Atlanta, GA 30341. Email: gaz5@cdc.gov.
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### Evidence of Data and Data Gaps Relevant to Human Exposures and Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uptake and Absorption</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Microplastics Data</th>
<th>Critical Data Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lungs</td>
<td>Measured directly in workers, along with health effects, and in animals</td>
<td>Measured in workers and in air</td>
<td>Not studied in nonworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immune system</td>
<td>Polyethylene was found to translocate lymphatics in implant patients and related to immune response</td>
<td>Measured translocation in implant patients; found in lymph nodes of workers</td>
<td>Not measured in the general population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurologic system</td>
<td>Polystyrene alters neurologic mouse cells only; polyethylene association with dopamine in humans</td>
<td>Measured in biota, but effects might be associated with nano size</td>
<td>Not measured in the general population; full pathways of uptake not demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal (GI) system</td>
<td>Measured in feces of general population; implied by association with health effects in workers; GI cancers</td>
<td>Measured translocation in animals after insertion; cancers associated with the work environment</td>
<td>Human data on GI absorption not known but associated with effects; feces microplastics and urine phthalates are nonspecific indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Implied by association with health effects in workers only</td>
<td>Injected microparticles circulated to liver; also measured in liver and spleen of implant patients</td>
<td>Not measured in workers, animals, or the general population but found in implant patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomagnification of other toxicants</td>
<td>Measured directly as a factor &gt;1x in marine animals, but no support for great magnification is demonstrated</td>
<td>Measurements in marine environment and in fish GI tracts indicate a decrease in the trophic levels, not an increase; therefore, the increase to humans is expected to be slight</td>
<td>Data in human food supply are needed; however, total exposure to many persistent pollutants occurs routinely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table is shaded to assist in identifying the largest data gaps for assessing microplastic exposure and effect. Yellow identifies a need for further characterization and green identifies there is sufficient characterization to demonstrate uptake and absorption is occurring. While evidence of uptake and absorption has been demonstrated, it is insufficient to fully link associated effects with exposure dose. Table modified from Zarus, Muianga, et al., 2021.

---

**TABLE 2**

**Evidence of Data and Data Gaps Relevant to Human Exposures and Effects**

**Uptake and Absorption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Microplastics Data</th>
<th>Critical Data Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lungs</td>
<td>Measured directly in workers, along with health effects, and in animals</td>
<td>Measured in workers and in air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immune system</td>
<td>Polyethylene was found to translocate lymphatics in implant patients and related to immune response</td>
<td>Measured translocation in implant patients; found in lymph nodes of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurologic system</td>
<td>Polystyrene alters neurologic mouse cells only; polyethylene association with dopamine in humans</td>
<td>Measured in biota, but effects might be associated with nano size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal (GI) system</td>
<td>Measured in feces of general population; implied by association with health effects in workers; GI cancers</td>
<td>Measured translocation in animals after insertion; cancers associated with the work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>Implied by association with health effects in workers only</td>
<td>Injected microparticles circulated to liver; also measured in liver and spleen of implant patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomagnification of other toxicants</td>
<td>Measured directly as a factor &gt;1x in marine animals, but no support for great magnification is demonstrated</td>
<td>Measurements in marine environment and in fish GI tracts indicate a decrease in the trophic levels, not an increase; therefore, the increase to humans is expected to be slight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table is shaded to assist in identifying the largest data gaps for assessing microplastic exposure and effect. Yellow identifies a need for further characterization and green identifies there is sufficient characterization to demonstrate uptake and absorption is occurring. While evidence of uptake and absorption has been demonstrated, it is insufficient to fully link associated effects with exposure dose. Table modified from Zarus, Muianga, et al., 2021.

---

**ATSDR microplastic working group: Identifying and addressing data needs to evaluate human exposures to microplastics [Poster presentation].** 32nd Annual Conference of the International Society of Environmental Epidemiology (virtual).
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If Rex had washed his hands in our Titan PRO 1 portable sink, maybe — just maybe he wouldn’t be extinct.
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- On-Demand Hot Water
- Out-of-the-Box Ready
- NSF-Certified
- Quick-Connect Tanks
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**SWEEPS** is a database software system designed to effectively manage your resources, staff and programs.

**SWEEPS** can help you meet the requirements for the NEHA-FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model (RFFM) Grant Program.
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**Did You Know?**

Members are extremely important to NEHA and its mission. The NEHA membership structure includes five different membership categories—Professional, Emerging Professional, Retired Professional, International, and Life. Environmental health professionals can benefit from NEHA membership at any career stage. NEHA membership provides credibility (credentials and leadership opportunities), learning (Journal, conferences, and continuing education), community (events, blogs, and webinars), and influence (advocacy and position papers).

Learn more at www.neha.org/join.
Keep Your Water Safe With Resources From the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Editor’s Note: The National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) strives to provide up-to-date and relevant information on environmental health and to build partnerships in the profession. In pursuit of these goals, NEHA features this column on environmental health services from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in every issue of the Journal.

In these columns, authors from CDC’s Water, Food, and Environmental Health Services Branch, as well as guest authors, will share tools, resources, and guidance for environmental health practitioners. The conclusions in these columns are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position of CDC.

Janie Hils and Justin Rokisky are both fellows with the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE) and they work on water projects. Elaine Curtiss is a contract health communicator. All work in the Water, Food, and Environmental Health Services Branch at CDC.

People in the U.S. have access to some of the safest public drinking water supplies in the world (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2021a). Environmental health professionals are one of the key groups that help make drinking water safe. They also help make water safe for communities that depend on private wells, residents in buildings with complex water systems, and swimmers who exercise regularly in pools. The Water, Food, and Environmental Health Services Branch (WFEHSB) within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) supports environmental health professionals with tools and resources to strengthen safe water for community health (Table 1).

In the U.S., the rate of reported cases of Legionnaires’ disease has grown by nearly nine times since 2000 (CDC, 2021b). Some resources that could help environmental health professionals are the Legionella Environmental Assessment Form and the Toolkit for Controlling Legionella in Common Sources of Exposure. The Legionella Environmental Assessment Form enables public health officials to gain a thorough understanding of a facility’s water systems and aerosolizing devices. The form also assists facility management with minimizing the risk of Legionnaires’ disease. The Legionella Environmental Assessment Form Marking Guide provides instructions and leads users through the form. In addition, the Toolkit for Controlling Legionella provides public health and building owners and operators with concise, actionable information on controlling Legionella in commonly implicated sources of Legionnaires’ disease outbreaks.

CDC investigations found that 9 out of 10 outbreaks of Legionnaires’ disease were caused by problems preventable with more effective management of water systems (CDC, 2016; Clopper et al., 2021). Water management programs are a key tool in preventing this deadly disease. Preventing Legionnaires’ Disease: A Training on Legionella Water Management Programs is a free training for professionals involved in water management programs that is designed to provide education on how to reduce risk for Legionella in buildings and facilities (Figure 1).

About 1 out of 8 residents in the U.S. gets their drinking water from private wells (Dieter et al., 2018; U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). Approximately 1 out of 5 sampled private wells has been found to be contaminated (DeSimone et al., 2009). WFEHSB recently restructured the Private Well webpage to help environmental health practitioners easily access helpful tools and resources such as fact sheets, guides, and GIS contaminant maps illustrating private well water quality. Practitioners can also find additional resources addressing why it is important to test well water and what contaminants to test for.

Swimming and other water-related activities are excellent ways to be physically active; however, they are not risk-free. CDC resources and tools can help environmental health programs maximize the benefits of healthy and safe swimming while minimizing the risk of illness and injury. The CDC Model Aquatic Health Code is a free, science-based guide that reduces the risk of waterborne illness outbreaks, drowning, and chemical poisonings at public pools and other aquatic venues. Furthermore, the CDC Pool Inspection Training for Environmental Health Professionals can help pool
inspectors improve their inspection skills and understanding of aquatic facility systems.

Malfunctioning septic systems can contaminate groundwater and surface water, potentially affecting individuals as well as the environment. Environmental health professionals can explore onsite (decentralized) wastewater resources for environmental health from CDC and partners, including Septic Smart resources from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

As water challenges continue to occur, we hope these resources are helpful to environmental health professionals at all levels (Table 1).

### Corresponding Author
Elaine Curtiss, National Center for Environmental Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 4770 Buford Highway, Atlanta, GA 30341. Email: ecurtiss@cdc.gov
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NEHA AFFILIATE AND REGIONAL LISTINGS

California
August 15–18, 2022: Annual Educational Symposium (AES), hosted by the Central Chapter of the California Environmental Health Association, Clovis, CA, https://www.ceha.org

Colorado

Florida

Georgia

Illinois
November 7–8, 2022: IEHA Annual Educational Conference, Illinois Environmental Health Association (IEHA), Utica, IL, https://ieha.coffeecup.com/calendar.html

Texas

Virginia
June 2, 2022: 2022 Spring Environmental Health Education Day (Virtual), Virginia Environmental Health Association, https://veha32.wildapricot.org/events

Wisconsin
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Fill a Job
Where the “best of the best” consult...

NEHA’s Career Center

First job listing FREE for state, tribal, local, and territorial health departments with a NEHA member.

For more information, please visit neha.org/careers.

Needs Peer Reviewers

The Journal of Environmental Health is currently in search of new peer reviewers. If interested, please fill out the online volunteer interest form at neha.org/volunteer-interest-form.
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Needs Peer Reviewers

The Journal of Environmental Health is currently in search of new peer reviewers. If interested, please fill out the online volunteer interest form at neha.org/volunteer-interest-form.
The AEC is back!
You never stopped...and neither did Accela

Accela Environmental Health software keeps the essential work of health departments going even in the most challenging and dynamic regulatory environment. Learn how at the NEHA 2022 AEC – we’ll be at booth #504.

Accela is proud to sponsor the AEC’s Technology Educational Track to support the continued advancement of technology in the environmental health practice.

Do you have a passion for the environment, preventing human injury and illness induced by environmental and workplace stressors? A career in Environmental Health Sciences is for you!

Graduates will learn to use scientific methods, interdisciplinary approaches, and problem solving to:

- Investigate, sample, measure, and assess hazardous agents in various environmental and occupational settings
- Develop, recommend and apply protective interventions that control hazards
- Engage community members and workers to understand, address, and resolve problems related to the environment and the workplace
- Assess climate change effect and its impact on communities, people and workers

Employers of our recent graduates:
CDC, DVA, JCDH, NASA, CIA, EPA, OSHA, Honda, Oak Ridge National Lab, Alabama Power, Michelin, Eli Lilly, 3M, Lockheed Martin, Disney, Honeywell, as well as many universities and colleges and non-profit organizations, with starting salaries ranging from $50K to $75K.

MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH
Environmental and Occupational Health

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN PUBLIC HEALTH
Environmental and Occupational Health or Industrial Hygiene*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
Environmental Health*

SOPH and other scholarships available. *NIOSH traineeship available for qualified candidates.

QUESTIONS? Contact Julie Brown, jebrown@uab.edu

go.uab.edu/EHS
Resource Corner highlights different resources the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) has available to meet your education and training needs. These resources provide you with information and knowledge to advance your professional development. Visit the NEHA online Bookstore for additional information about these and many other pertinent resources!

National Environmental Health Association (2021)

The Registered Environmental Health Specialist/Registered Sanitarian (REHS/RS) credential is the premier credential of the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA). This new edition reflects the most recent changes and advancements in environmental health technologies and theories. Incorporating the insights of 29 subject matter experts from across academia, industry, and the regulatory community, paired with references from over 30 scholarly resources, this essential reference is intended to help those seeking to obtain the NEHA REHS/RS credential. Chapters include general environmental health; statutes and regulations; food protection; potable water; wastewater; solid and hazardous waste; hazardous materials; zoonoses, vectors, pests, and poisonous plants; radiation protection; occupational safety and health; air quality and environmental noise; housing sanitation and safety; institutions and licensed establishments; swimming pools and recreational facilities; and emergency preparedness.

261 pages / Spiral-bound paperback
Member: $169 / Nonmember: $199

**Principles of Food Sanitation (6th Edition)**

Now in its 6th edition, this highly acclaimed book provides sanitation information needed to ensure hygienic practices and safe food for food industry professionals and students. It addresses the principles related to contamination, cleaning compounds, sanitizers, and cleaning equipment. It also presents specific directions for applying these concepts to attain hygienic conditions in food processing or preparation operations. The new edition includes updated chapters on the fundamentals of food sanitation, as well as new information on contamination sources and hygiene, HACCP, waste handling disposal, biosecurity, allergens, quality assurance, pest control, and sanitation management principles. Study reference for the NEHA Registered Environmental Health Specialist/Registered Sanitarian and Certified Professional–Food Safety credential exams.

437 pages / Hardback
Member: $84 / Nonmember: $89

Herman Koren and Alma Mary Anderson (2021)

The 4th edition of this bestseller provides up-to-date information for newly promoted or management-aspiring professionals and engineers in the fields of environmental health, occupational health and safety, water and wastewater treatment, public health, and other environmental professions. The book is also an excellent resource for students interested in learning management skills prior to entering the workforce. Through nine sets of tools, the first volume explains the basic principles supervisors need to understand the structure of their organization, what leadership is, how to effectively plan and budget, how to manage other people, and best practices for achieving success in a management position.

258 pages / Paperback
Member: $49 / Nonmember: $56

Herman Koren and Alma Mary Anderson (2021)

The 4th edition of this bestseller provides up-to-date information for newly promoted or management-aspiring professionals and engineers in the fields of environmental health, occupational health and safety, water and wastewater treatment, public health, and other environmental professions. The book is also an excellent resource for students interested in learning management skills prior to entering the workforce. The second volume explains the advanced principles that supervisors need to understand the art of communications and resolving communications problems, as well as the supervisor or manager’s role in teaching, counseling, and managing employee performance, health, and safety.

276 pages / Paperback
Member: $49 / Nonmember: $56
FOOD HANDLER CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

- Updated to the 2017 FDA Food Code
- Textbook and self-paced online learning versions
- ANSI accredited

Order today at www.neha.org/handler
For more information contact nehatraining@neha.org or call 303.802.2147

Updated to the 2017 FDA Food Code

NEHA PROFESSIONAL FOOD MANAGER 6TH EDITION

- Edited for clarity, improved learning, and retention
- Content aligns with American Culinary Federation Education Foundation competencies
- Prepares candidates for CFP-approved food manager exams (e.g., Prometric, National Registry, ServSafe, etc.)
- Discounts for bulk orders and NEHA Food Safety Instructors

Professional Food Manager Online Course is also available
To order books or find out more about becoming a NEHA food safety instructor, call 303.802.2147 or visit neha.org

NOW AVAILABLE IN SPANISH!
Election of Eric Bradley to Diplomate Laureate in the American Academy of Sanitarians

The American Academy of Sanitarians (AAS) is pleased to announce the election of Eric Bradley, MPH, REHS, CP-FS, as its new Diplomate Laureate. Bradley has worked in environmental health for more than 25 years at county health departments in Georgia, Illinois, and Iowa, including 6 years as environmental health manager at the Scott County Health Department in Davenport, Iowa. He is currently the deputy health director at the Linn County Public Health Department in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Bradley is the executive secretary/treasurer for the AAS Board of Directors, a past-president of the Iowa Environmental Health Association, and active with several legislative and advocacy committees in Iowa. He serves as a technical advisor for food safety for the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) and currently chairs the NEHA Food Safety Program Committee. He is also a peer reviewer for the Journal of Environmental Health.

Formed in 1966, AAS is an organization that elevates the standards, improves the practice, advances the professional proficiency, and promotes the highest levels of ethical conduct among professionals in environmental health. Certification by AAS is open to individuals who have attained high professional stature through leadership and accomplishment in the field of environmental health and meet rigorous selection criteria. AAS created the certification of a Diplomate Laureate in 1999 to recognize Diplomates who have demonstrated exceptional professional growth, accomplishment, and leadership in the environmental health profession. The Laureate must demonstrate longevity in the profession and meet six additional criteria that include extraordinary accomplishments in the field and professional practice of environmental health. Visit www.sanitarians.org to learn more about AAS.

People on the Move is designed to keep NEHA members informed about what their peers in environmental health are up to. If you or someone you know has received a promotion, changed careers, or earned a special recognition in the profession, please notify Kristen Ruby-Cisneros at kruby@neha.org. It is our pleasure to announce the achievements and new directions of our members. This feature will run only when we have material to print—so be sure to send in your announcements!

Did You Know?

June is National Healthy Homes Month. The celebration highlights housing-related health and safety hazards and encourages residents to take action to make their homes safe and healthy. The 2022 theme is, “A Healthy Home @ Any Age.” Visit www.hud.gov/program_offices/healthy_homes/nhhm to learn more.

Choosing a career that protects the basic necessities like food, water, and air for people in your communities already proves that you have dedication. Now, take the next step and open new doors with the Registered Environmental Health Specialist/Registered Sanitarian (REHS/RS) credential from NEHA. It is the gold standard in environmental health and shows your commitment to excellence—to yourself and the communities you serve. Find out if you are eligible to apply at neha.org/rehs.

A credential today can improve all your tomorrows.
Purpose-built EHS technology for environmental health agencies.

With multilingual capability for inspectors and communities.

For more information:

¡Hola!

Bonjour!

Hedgerow
hedgerowsoftware.com
Let’s Connect

...to Each Other

...to the Outdoors

...to Your Family
NEHA 2022 AEC In-Person Social Events

Connecting with friends and colleagues is one of the most important aspects of the conference-going experience. NEHA hosts social events for conference attendees to build connections and get to know one another.

Exhibition Grand Opening & Party
Immediately following the Opening Session and Keynote Address, attendees are invited to gather in the Exhibit Hall for snacks, drinks, and mingling with our sponsors and Exhibit Hall partners.

Reconnecting on the River Networking Event
Take delight in dinner and drinks with new and old friends while enjoying music, entertainment, and the beauty of the Spokane River Walk!

Use this QR code to learn more about what is in store and the precautions we are taking for COVID-19.

Visit us online for the latest information

NEHA.ORG/AEC
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  Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Term expires 2022.

- **Region 5**—Traci (Slowinski) Michelson, MS, REHS, CP-FS 
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- **Larry Ramdin**, MPH, MA, REHS/RS, CP-FS, HHS, CHO, Region 9 Vice-President
- **David Dyjack**, DrPH, CIH, Executive Director
- **Gina Bare**, RN, Associate Director, PPD, gbare@neha.org
- **Kate Beasley**, Digital Communications Specialist, kbeasley@neha.org
- **Jesse Bliss**, MPH, Director, PPD, jbliss@neha.org
- **Faye Blumberg**, Instructional Designer, NEHA EZ, fblumberg@neha.org
- **Nick Bohnenkamp**, Program and Operations Manager, PPD, nbohnenkamp@neha.org
- **Trisha Bramwell**, Sales and Training Support, NEHA EZ, tbramwell@neha.org
- **Renee Clark**, Director, Finance, rclark@neha.org
- **Holly Cypress**, Administrative Support, PPD, hcypress@neha.org
- **Joetta DeFrancisco**, Retail Program Standards Coordinator, NEHA-FDA RFFM, jdefrancisco@neha.org
- **Kristie Denbrock**, MPA, Chief Learning Officer, kdenbrock@neha.org
- **Rosie DeVito**, MPH, Program and Operations Manager, rdevito@neha.org
- **Steven Dourdis**, MA, Human Resources Business Partner, sdourdis@neha.org
- **David Dyjack**, DrPH, CIH, Executive Director, ddyjack@neha.org
- **Doug Farquhar, JD**, Director, Government Affairs, dfarquhar@neha.org
- **Soní Fink**, Sales Manager, sfink@neha.org
- **Anna Floyd, PhD**, Instructional Designer, EF, aflloyd@neha.org
- **Heather Folker**, Director, Member Services and Credentialing, hfolker@neha.org
- **Nathan Galanos**, Contracts Administrator, ngalanos@neha.org
- **Adrienne Goard**, Program Coordinator, PPD, agoard@neha.org
- **Chaña Goussetis**, MA, Marketing and Communications Director, cgoussetis@neha.org
- **Elizabeth Grenier**, Senior Project Coordinator, NEHA-FDA RFFM, egrenier@neha.org
- **Thyra Kimbell**, Project Coordinator, tkimbell@neha.org
- **Nicole Kinash**, Administrative and Logistical Support, NEHA EZ, nkinash@neha.org
- **Beky Labbo, MA**, Evaluation Coordinator, PPD, rlabbo@neha.org
- **Terryn Laird**, Public Health Communications Specialist, tlaird@neha.org
- **Melodie Lake**, Editor/Copy Writer, NEHA EZ, mlake@neha.org
- **Angelica Ledezma**, AEC Manager, aledezma@neha.org
- **Stephanie Lenhart, MBA**, Senior Accountant, slenhart@neha.org
- **Matt Lieber**, Database Administrator, mlieber@neha.org
- **Dillon Loaiza**, Accounts Payable Specialist, dloaiza@neha.org
- **Julianne Manchester, PhD**, Senior Research and Evaluation Specialist, NEHA-FDA RFFM, jmanchester@neha.org
- **Bobby Medina**, Credentialing Specialist, bmedina@neha.org
- **Jaclyn Miller**, Marketing and Communications Specialist, NEHA-FDA RFFM, jmiller@neha.org
- **Avery Moyler**, Training and Contractor Supervisor, NEHA EZ, amoyler@neha.org
- **Eileen Neison**, Credentialing Manager, eneison@neha.org
- **Michael Newman, A+, ACA**, MCTS, Director, Information Technology, mnewman@neha.org
- **Nick Oggi**, Media Production Specialist, NEHA EZ, noggi@neha.org
- **Kim Pacifico**, Senior Accountant, kpacifico@neha.org
- **Amber Potts, REHS, CP-FS**, Senior Project Coordinator, PPD, apotts@neha.org
- **Kristen Ruby-Cisneros**, Managing Editor, JEH, krbuy@neha.org
- **Michele Samarya-Timm, MA, HO, REHS, MCHES, DAAS**, Senior Program Analyst, Environmental Health, PPD, msamaryatimm@neha.org
- **Katherine Sheppard**, Executive Assistant, ksheppard@neha.org
- **Sadie Shervheim**, Public Health Associate, sshervheim@neha.org
2021–2022 Technical Advisors

www.neha.org/technical-advisors

CLIMATE AND HEALTH

David Gilkey, PhD
dgilkey@mtech.edu

Steve Konkel, PhD
steve.konkel@gmail.com

DATA AND TECHNOLOGY

Darryl Booth, MBA
dbooth@accela.com

Timothy Callahan, MPH
tim.callahan@dph.ga.gov

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Latasha A. Allen, MSPH, MEDM
latisha.allen@hhs.gov

Martin Kalis
mkalis@cdc.gov

Luis Rodriguez
ved8@cdc.gov

FOOD SAFETY

Eric Bradley, MPH, REHS,
CP-FS, DAAS
ericbradley30252@gmail.com

Tracynda Davis, MPH
tracynda.davis@fda.hhs.gov

Zachary Ehrlich
zachary.ehrlich@doh.nj.gov

Adam Kramer, MPH, ScD, RS
akramer2@cdc.gov

Cindy Rice, MPH, RS,
CP-FS, CEHTrice@neha.org

Christine Sylvis, REHS
sylvis@snhd.org

GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Michael Crea, MS
mcrea@edgegiercing.com

Tara Guruge, MS, RS, CEHT
tguruge@needhamma.gov

Greg Kearney, MPH, DrPH, REHS
kearneyg@ecu.edu

Adam Mannarino
adam.mannarino@gmail.com

Clint Pinion, Jr., DrPH, RS, CIT
clint.pinion@sw.edu

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

Stan Hazan, MPH
hazan@nsf.org

Robert Powitz, MPH, PhD, RS, CP-FS
powitz@sanitarian.com

Robert Washam, MPH, RS, DAAS
b.washam@hotmail.com

INFECTIOUS AND VECTORBORNE DISEASES

Tyler Zerwekh MPH, DrPH, REHS
tyler.zerwekh@tls.hs.tx.us

SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Natasha DeJarnett, MPH, PhD
natasha.dejarnett@louisville.edu

Cynthia McOlliver, MPH, PhD
mcolliver.cynthia@epa.gov

Welford Roberts, MS, PhD, REHS/RS, DAAS
welford@erols.com

WATER QUALITY

Jason Ravenscroft, MPH, REHS, CPO
jravencs@marionhealth.org

Andrew Whelton, MPH
awhelton@purdue.edu

Steve Wilson
sdwilson@illinois.edu

WORKFORCE AND LEADERSHIP

Robert Custard, REHS, CP-FS
bobcustard@comcast.net

Lauren DiPrete, MPH, REHS
diprete@snhd.org

Affiliate Presidents

www.neha.org/affiliates

Alabama—Russell Harry
russell.harvey@adph.state.al.us

Alaska—Joy Britt
jbritt@anfhc.org

Arizona—David Morales
david.morales@maricopa.gov

Arkansas—Richard Taffner, RS
richard.taffner@arkansas.gov

Business and Industry—
Michael Crea
nehabia@outlook.com

California—Darryl Wong
president@ceha.org

Colorado—Josh Skegg
jskegg@cdh.org

Connecticut—Chris Buter,
RS/REHS
sanitarian@esdh.org

Florida—Edward Bettinger
ed.bettinger@flhealth.gov

Georgia—Melinda Knight
gehaonline@gmail.com

Idaho—Carolee Cooper
carolee.cooper@dhw.idaho.gov

Illinois—Justin Dwyer
jdwyer84@gmail.com

Indiana—Holley M. Rose
brose@trippleycounty.com

Iowa—Matt Even
meven@bentoncountyia.gov

Jamaica (International Partner Organization)—Karen Brown
info@japhi.org.jm

Kansas—Tanner Langer
tdlanger@cowleycounty.org

Kentucky—Brittany Wells, RS
tkentuckyeha@gmail.com

Louisiana—Carolyn Bombet
carolyn.bombet@la.gov

Massachusetts—Diane Chalifoux-Judge, REHS/RS, CP-FS
diane.chalifoux@boston.gov

Michigan—Andrew Priest
apriest@mcna.aha.org

Minnesota—Lisa Schrefels, REHS
president@nehaonline.org

Missouri—Ryan Tilley
rirley@ccmco.org

Montana—Sarah Robin
sarahrenn barriers@gmail.com

National Capital Area—Julia Balsley, REHS
balsley@nehaonline.org

North Dakota—Julie Wagendorf
jwagendorf@nd.gov

Northern New England Environmental Health Association—Brian Lockard
blackart@ci.salem.nh.us

North Carolina—Tonya Zimmerman
ncenh@ncenh.org

Pennsylvania—Vince Radke, MPH, RS, CP-FS, DLAAS, CPH
vradke@bellesouth.net

Rhode Island—Dottie LeBeau,
CP-FS
djlebeau@verizon.net

South Carolina—M.L. Tanner, HHS
tannerm@dlhec.sc.gov

Tennessee—Kimberly Davidson
kimberly.davidson@tn.gov

Texas—John Shradar
shradar@cb specialties.com

Uniformed Services—MAJ
Nathanial Sheehan
nathaniel.sheehan@outlook.com

Utah—Karl Hartman
khartman@utah.gov

Virginia—Jessica Stewart
jessica.stewart@virginiaeha.org

Washington—Tom Kunes
tkunes@co.whatcom.wa.us

West Virginia—Keith Allison
wwaso@outlook.com

Wisconsin—Carrie Pohjola
carrie.pohjola@wisconsin.gov

Wyoming—Chelle Schwope
chelle.schwope@wyo.gov
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NEHA 2022 General Election Results

By Angelica Ledezma (aledezma@neha.org)

Elections are a critical part of the democratic process and one way to provide members a voice in the running of their organization. Voting members of the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) have an opportunity to vote for candidates of contested board of directors and regional vice-president positions, as well as cast votes regarding proposed Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws changes.

National officers of the NEHA Board of Directors serve a 1-year term in each officer position (second vice-president, first vice-president, president-elect, president, and immediate past-president) for a total of 5 years. Regional vice-presidents (RVPs) serve 3-year terms.

Eligible voters were encouraged to vote during the month of March and the deadline to vote was March 31, 2022. The following are results from the 2022 general election.

Second Vice-President

There were two qualified candidates for the second vice-president position: Michele DiMaggio, REHS, and Larry Ramdin, MPH, MA, REHS/RS, CP-FS, HHS, CHO. All eligible NEHA members were asked to vote for the position of second vice-president and Larry Ramdin received the majority of votes. Both candidate profiles were published in the March 2022 Journal of Environmental Health (JEH) and on the NEHA website at www.neha.org/node/60552. Ramdin will assume the second vice-president position at the close of the NEHA 2022 Annual Educational Conference (AEC) & Exhibition on July 1, 2022.

Regional Vice-Presidents

The NEHA membership is broken down into nine regions that represent U.S. geographic areas, as well as members in the U.S. military and abroad. The terms of three regional vice-president (RVP) positions expire in 2022—Region 4: Kim Carlton; Region 6: Nichole Lemin; and Region 9: Larry Ramdin.

Regions 4 and 6 each had one eligible candidate and did not appear on the election ballot. There were no candidates for Region 9. All candidate profiles were published in the March 2022 JEH.

Both of these candidates will automatically assume their RVP roles at the close of the NEHA 2022 AEC on July 1, 2022, and their terms will expire in 2025:

- Region 4: Kim Carlton, MPH, REHS/RS (Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin);
- Region 6: Nichole Lemin, MEP, RS/REHS (Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio); and
- Region 9: Vacant (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont)

A listing of current NEHA national officers and RVPs, along with state breakdowns for each region, can be found on page 52. More information about NEHA’s governance, including its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, the election processes, and associated deadlines, can be found at www.neha.org/about-neha/governance.

Thank you to all members who participated in the 2022 election!

NEHA-FDA RFFFM Grant Program Awards $7 Million in First Year to Promote Food Safety

In March 2022, more than $7 million was awarded to 228 unique state, local, territorial, and tribal (SLTT) jurisdictions nationwide to strengthen their regulatory retail food programs and practices. The funding, provided through the National Environmental Health Association-Food and Drug Administration (NEHA-FDA) Retail Flexible Funding Model (RFFM) Grant Program, is part of a 3-year grant that provides funding to U.S. jurisdictions in charge of regulating retail food to prevent foodborne illness.

The grant program is the first of its kind and is designed to support SLTT regulatory retail food jurisdictions to align with the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards). Ensuring that the practices of a food safety program are aligned with the Retail Program Standards is one of the most important steps a jurisdiction can take to advance retail food safety efforts across the U.S.

“NEHA is honored to lead this transformative opportunity to improve food safety practices across the country by leveraging and promoting the Retail Program Standards. Together, we can reduce foodborne illness,” said Roy Kroeger, REHS, president of NEHA.

The new RFFM model combines three previous grant programs into one to make the approaches for grantees more flexible and responsive to the capacity and ambition of a jurisdiction. In the first year of the grant program, a total of 444 grants were awarded to 228 unique jurisdictions, including:

- 228 base grants (Development and Maintenance & Advancement),
- 54 Mentorship grants,
- 129 Training/Staff Development grants,
- 9 Special Projects grants, and
- 26 Capacity Building grants.

The program also features mentorship—spearheaded by the National Association of County and City Health Officials—that provides jurisdictions with the opportunity to learn from, collaborate, and support one another as they work to achieve the Retail Program Standards.

“The program continues to invest in the health and safety of communities through public health interventions while facilitating collaboration among SLTTs,” said David Dyjack, DrPH, CIH, executive director of NEHA. “The impressive level of participation in year one shows how important retail food safety is, even amid a global pandemic.”

More information about the NEHA-FDA RFFFM Grant Program can be found at www.neha.org/retailgrants. A summary of the grant awards for year 1 and an interactive map that displays the type of grant and amount awarded to each grantee is available at www.neha.org/retailgrants/awards.
NEHA Staff Profiles

As part of tradition, NEHA features new staff members in the Journal around the time of their 1-year anniversary. These profiles give you an opportunity to get to know the NEHA staff better and to learn more about the great programs and activities going on in your association. This month we are pleased to introduce you to two NEHA staff members. Contact information for all NEHA staff can be found on pages 52 and 53.

Holly Cypress
I joined the NEHA staff in June 2021 as administrative support for the Program and Partnership Development (PPD) department. I live in Maryland and work with our Washington, DC, office team. I graduated from the University of Maryland with a bachelor's of science in business with a marketing major. I worked at Black Entertainment Television as a corporate marketing manager, developing industry targeted advertising and marketing campaigns. From there, I went on to work for a design firm and help create an online employee benefits reference site for the state of Maryland. I then joined a full-service marketing firm and worked with the Child and Family Services Agency in Washington, DC, to create their first resource handbook for foster and adoptive parents and legal guardians. This handbook has received many accolades from other family services agencies across the U.S.

After taking 5 years away from the workforce to care for my ailing mother, I went back into the job market for Green Seal, a global nonprofit organization that pioneered the ecolabeling movement with a mission to transform the economy for a healthier, greener world. I worked as the administrative assistant to the chief finance officer and office manager. Through my work at Green Seal, I truly found a greater level of appreciation for sustainability and the importance of a healthy environment.

I am very proud to now work as the administrative support professional for the NEHA PPD department, which works with federal partners—such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Food and Drug Administration, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—on important and diverse projects including climate change, food safety, water quality, preparedness, and more.

Stephanie Lenhart
I am a self-proclaimed native of Colorado as I have been in the state since I was little. I grew up with a fondness for numbers and puzzles, leading me to pursue accounting and finance in school. There was something satisfying about the initial simplicity of accounting that called to me. After I graduated from the University of Colorado with a bachelor's degree in accounting, I started my career working in mutual funds before going on active duty with the U.S. military.

I spent a few years with U.S. Air Force Space Command and found that nonprofit work was what I wanted to focus on after my time was up in the U.S. military. I wanted to work with an organization that helps others and supports continual improvement. Prior to leaving active duty, I obtained my master's degree with an emphasis in accounting and a specialized focus on nonprofit accounting. Needless to say, I really enjoy working with numbers.

I started with NEHA in June 2021 as a senior accountant within the organization's finance department. While my days are usually busy, my primary functions are cash management, accounts receivable, and the NEHA-FDA Retail Flexible Funding Model Grant Program.

In my personal life, I have a deep love for anything that is related to Marvel, anime, or puzzles. When I am not working, you can usually find my family outside with our three huskies trotting along the beautiful Colorado trails.

Land reuse can be a powerful tool to transform the health of communities. Now you can learn about land reuse and brownfields redevelopment with the Environmental Health and Land Reuse Certificate. In this free, online course from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and NEHA, you can learn to identify and redevelop land reuse sites. The modules include an introduction to the program, engaging with the community, evaluating and communicating environmental and health risks, redesigning with health in mind, and measuring success. With self-paced and group learning options, you can learn—and earn continuing education contact hours—on your own schedule. Visit www.neha.org/ehlr for more information.
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
It’s a tough job.
That’s why you love it.

Join the only community of people as dedicated as you are about protecting human health and the environment.

Begin connecting today through NEHA membership.

neha.org/join

NOW AVAILABLE:
The updated REHS/RS Study Guide Fifth Edition!

Recreated in a fresh visual layout to enhance the reading and studying experience

Helps identify content areas of strength and areas where more studying is needed

Incorporates insights of 29 subject matter experts

Includes 15 chapters covering critical exam content areas

Visit our Study References page for more information!
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profession plays a central role in the anticipation and control of these diseases and conditions? I felt it was important to share our experience at our 2017 Annual Educational Conference & Exhibition in Grand Rapids, Michigan. It was there that we inserted a last-minute session on the opioid epidemic. The session was on the last day of the conference, just before the final closing program. Much to my surprise, it was standing room only. I was impressed by the replies when I inquired why so many of us elected to attend this educational session. Many of our members were involved in drug take-back programs, needle exchange programs, or had been reassigned to work on opioids. This example is yet another of the value the profession delivers on behalf of society.

I wrapped up my presentation with some vintage “Dave storytelling” to personify our association members and to remind the attendees that no matter how South Carolina elected officials decide to parse out and administer its public health services, the environmental health profession will continue to create and deliver impactful interventions and recommendations on behalf of state residents. I closed by sharing my belief that environmental health professionals are meta-leaders and that the profession is uniquely constructed to bridge the spaces among the public health professions. We have the ability and insight to describe and prescribe preventive and corrective measures. When given the opportunity, we can compress morbidity, reducing the cost of disease and exposure to society. We are hotbeds of innovation, providing targeted solutions in profoundly local public health environments.

The decision to reorganize public health and environmental health in South Carolina is theirs to make. I trust the elected official’s commitment and wisdom to do what is in the best interest of their residents. My commentary is solely dedicated to the proposition that environmental public health is an important contributor to the state’s economy and health status.

As I write this column, the BA.2 COVID variant now comprises over 50% of new cases in the U.S. and the Food and Drug Administration just approved a new round of boosters for individuals over 50 years. I ask everyone to use discretion as you make personal and professional decisions on the in-person events you elect to attend. I understand the desire to get out, as I did to attend this conference. I also understand that each of us needs to search out opportunities to remind our professional networks of the value we deliver to society. One of the comments from Dr. Jimmie Smith, a conference presenter from Georgia, rings true to me: “We must show up and speak up to make things right.”

Environmental public health at the dawn of a new era in South Carolina. Photo courtesy of David Dyjack.
Fluorescent green threads appeared out of nowhere in the predawn blue hour. Alarmingly they seemed to be making a direct line for me. When they broached my personal space, perhaps 100 yards off, I was able to make out the vague outline of galloping dogs. The dayglow threads were collars and the collars were attached to large Doberman Pinschers. A calm, distant voice of a woman called out and the canines were brought to a heel. So much for a salubrious morning jog on South Carolina’s Myrtle Beach, where I was attending and speaking at the American Public Health Association (APHA) state affiliate meeting this spring.

This conference was the first I have attended in 2022, and it was wonderful to connect in person. The program was nurturing from multiple perspectives. First, the A-list of speakers was notable: state and local leadership, philanthropy, academia, practitioners, community organizers, and students, among others. The agenda was equally eclectic, covering the vast landscape of the public health enterprise. I was the sole voice of environmental public health. I had been requested to speak to the contributions of the environmental health profession to public health. Frankly, it was an easy but politically loaded assignment. You see, the South Carolina legislature is contemplating creation of a Department of Behavioral and Public Health that would exclude environmental public health. The current South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control and the South Carolina Board of Health and Environmental Control would be abolished under the proposed initiative. Environmental health services would be, under the plan, fragmented into agriculture and a separate department of environmental services.

“Environmental public health is the backbone of public health.” I hit hard right out of the gate as I addressed the audience. There is an increasing body of evidence that a wet market in Wuhan, China, was the source of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. We estimate that 75% of infectious disease today arise from zoonotic origins, and that the human desire for animal protein presents the single largest risk for the next pandemic. The Ebola virus, tularemia, and brucellosis are other examples. Think retail food safety, the single largest responsibility of most local environmental public health practitioners. What happens in the meat markets of Africa and China affects public health in the U.S. A U.S.-based think tank produced a guidance document in March 2022 on how best to live with endemic COVID-19. Environmental health features prominently in the document, with an emphasis on indoor air quality.

This conference was primarily attended by members and supporters of the local APHA affiliate. I reminded the audience that APHA was created in 1872 by a sanitary, Dr. Stephen Smith, to primarily address water, sanitation, and hygiene. Specifically, much of the work early in APHAs history was focused on environmental health issues such as conditions that exacerbated tuberculosis, contaminated milk, and air pollution. I shared the cover of the March 2020 American Journal of Public Health (AJPH) that headlined a National Environmental Health Association research article focused on our workforce. If our profession is not central to public health, why would the prestigious AJPH highlight our publication?

From there I picked up momentum as I described the core functions of public health—assessment, assurance, and policy development. Each of these pillars have environmental health embedded into them. I pointed out that environmental health is the second largest part of the public health workforce. Finally, I shared the 2012 report that describes environmental health as a foundational public health service. Compelling evidence of the centrality of environmental health to public health abounds.

My presentation began to click as I described how South Carolina is affected by a variety of environmental health challenges that will impact the health, safety, and financial prosperity of the state. I reviewed how the state has endemic Lyme disease, harmful algal blooms, droughts, flooding, and wildfires. Which pro-

continued on page 57

David Dyjack, DrPH, CIH

Exploring Secrets by the Sea

Environmental public health is the backbone of public health.
LABORATORY TESTING SERVICES

- WATER QUALITY TESTING: E. Coli, Fecal Coliforms, Total Coliforms & More
- FOOD SAFETY TESTING: Salmonella, Listeria, Pathogens
- LEGIONELLA TESTING: CDC Elite Certified Labs
- LEAD & METALS TESTING: Air, Water, Soil, Dust, Paint Chips
- ENVIRONMENTAL TESTING: VOC’s, PCB’s, PFAS, TCLP
- INDOOR AIR QUALITY TESTING: Formaldehyde, Particulates & More
- MOLD TESTING: Spore Traps, Tape Lifts, Swabs, ERMI, Culture Plates
- ASBESTOS TESTING: TEM, PLM, PCM, SEM, XRD
- SILICA TESTING: Crystalline Silica & Amorphous Silica ID
- FIRE & SMOKE TESTING: Soot, Char, Ash, Cigarette & Marijuana Smoke
HealthSpace™ has evolved.

HS GovTech™ is excited to debut the latest evolution of technology for environmental health departments as we go ... Beyond Data Management.

Visit the most experienced team in the industry at booth 301.

Don't miss the debut of our Beyond Data Management tools.

Date: 6/29
Time: 10:00am
Location: Main Exhibit Hall

HS GovTech™ is proud to be the presenting sponsor of NEHA 2022 AEC