

# HUMAN HEALTH AND SOCIOECONOMIC SYSTEMS

Lynn M. Grattan, J.Glenn Morris\* University of Maryland School of Medicine \*Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida

# mrotialy lio noziroly retayqeed Explosion

- April 20, 2010
- 11 killed
- 5 month spill
- 206 million gallons
- 88,522 mi Gulf
- 950 mi shoreline





# **Economic Losses**



# Declining Work







# Participating Communities



#### Baldwin Co, AL (direct oil impact)

#### Franklin Co, FL (no direct oil impact)

50 km

#### Demographic Summary (n= 76, Grattan et al., EHP, 2011)

• Age: Mid 40's Education: 10-12 Gender: Males > Females Race: 95% Caucasian Occupations: Fishing, Tourism Hx Depression/Anxiety (6%) Hx Alcohol Problem (9.5%)

## Key Variables

GEOGRAPHY EXPOSURE ECONOMIC STATUS

Oil Exposed (direct exp)
No Oil (indirect exp)

Financial Loss

Financially Stable

# Potential Human Health Impacts

- Neurotoxic Exposures
- Major Depressive Episodes
- Anxiety Disorders
- Alcoholism
- Drug Abuse
- Domestic Violence
- Post Traumatic Stress Disorder
- Medical Symptoms

#### Field Assessments (July, 2010)

 Neurocognitive Anxiety Depression Coping Resilience Medical **Symptoms** 





# Neurocognitive Assessment • Attention • Concentra



Concentration Memory Construction • Psychomotor Clerical speed Olfaction • Malingering

#### Field Assessments (July, 2010)

 Neurocognitive Anxiety Depression Medical **Symptoms**  Coping Resilience





#### Measured Resilience Connor Davidson Resilience Scale

- **1.** Stay focused under pressure
- 2. Maintain stable level of function
- 3. Handle unpleasant feelings
- 4. Achieve goals despite obstacles
- 5. Not easily discouraged by failure



Self-distraction Active coping Denial Substance Use Emotional Support Instrumental Support Behavioral Disengagement Venting Positive Reframing Planning Humor Acceptance Self-blame Religion

#### **Exposure Group Cognitive Scores**

Cognitive Measures	Indirect Exposure (n = 71)	Direct Exposure (n =23)	p -value
Digit Span	45.54 (21.61)	42.09 (7.93)	0.11
Stroop	49.33 (7.73)	50.09 (7.37)	0.68
Symbol Digit Modalities	44.49 (12.01)	41.91 (10.35)	0.36
Trails A	47.40 (11.65)	48.35 (11.65)	0.70
Trails B	47.06 (10.92)	45.48 (7.59)	0.52
Grooved Pegboard dominant hand	46.76 (10.83)	42.04 (10.61)	0.07
Grooved Pegboard non-dominant	45.27 (9.76)	39.83 (10.60)	0.02*

#### **Exposure Group Psychosocial Scores**

<b>Psychosocial Measures</b>	Indirect Exposure (n = 71)	Direct Exposure (n =23)	p -value
Profile of Mood States Tension/Anxiety Depression Anger Fatigue Confusion Vigor Total Mood Disturbance	56.89 (17.97) 55.70 (20.22) 56.13 (20.63) 49.41 (16.87) 54.92 (20.16) 40.44 (13.94) 55.66 (20.07)	62.44 (11.33) 57.70 (12.99) 59.91 (13.24) 55.83 (12.95) 60.78 (11.62) 41.61 (10.16) 61.13 (11.71)	0.17 0.66 0.41 0.10 0.19 0.71 0.22
POMS suspected clin. Impairment Tension/Anxiety Depression	44 50	48 35	0.76 0.21
Connor Davidson Resilience	29.07 (6.16)	29.87 (5.86)	0.59

#### **Exposure Group Psychosocial Scores Cont.**

Brief COPE	Indirect Exposure (n = 71)	Direct Exposure (n =23)	p -value
Self-distraction	4.60 (2.10)	4.40 (1.70)	0.72
Active coping	4.70 (2.10)	6.10 (2.00)	0.01*
Denial	4.00 (2.20)	3.40 (2.00)	0.25
Substance use	2.80 (1.40)	2.70 (1.60)	0.81
Use of emotional support	3.80 (1.70)	3.60 (1.70)	0.71
Use of instrumental support	3.80 (1.90)	3.90 (1.80)	0.82
Behavioral disengagement	3.20 (1.50)	2.80 (1.40)	0.28
Venting	4.00 (1.70)	4.50 (1.60)	0.18
Positive reframing	4.60 (1.90)	5.10 (1.90)	0.21
Planning	5.10 (1.90)	5.80 (2.00)	0.13
Humor	3.00 (1.50)	4.00 (2.30)	0.08
Acceptance	5.60 (1.90)	6.30 (1.50)	0.09
Religion	4.60 (2.30)	5.60 (2.40)	0.11
Self-blame	2.80 (1.30)	2.80 (1.50)	0.77

# Health Symptoms or Complaints

# No difference from baseline in either exposure group

#### **Economic Loss Group Demographics**

Characteristics	Stable Income (n = 47)	Economic Loss (n = 47)	p-value
Gender	32 (68)	25 (53)	0.14
Age Range	49.32 (16.92) 19—88	45.19 (13.97) 22—79	0.20
Education Range	12.26 (3.21) 5—20	11.59 (2.56) 5—18	0.27
Race Caucasian African American Native American	(41) 89 4 (9) 1 (2)	45 (96) 2 (4) 0 (0)	0.40

#### **Economic Loss Group Cognitive Scores**

Cognitive Measures	Stable Income (n = 47)	Economic Loss (n = 47)	p -value
Digit Span	43.92 (10.24)	45.48 (7.92)	0.42
Stroop	49.21 (7.48)	49.86 (7.80)	0.69
Symbol Digit Modalities	42.36 (12.10)	45.31 (11.03)	0.23
Trails A	45.63 (9.65)	49.69 (10.36)	0.09
Trails B	45.13 (9.38)	48.22 (10.80)	0.15
Grooved Pegboard dominant hand	43.54 (11.17)	47.48 (10.40)	0.10
Grooved Pegboard non-dominant	42.60 (10.82)	44.98 (9.58)	0.29
(Creathan st. a) 2011. Environmental Haalth Demonstring)			

#### Economic Loss Group POMS Raw Mean Scores

Stable Income (n = 47)	Economic Loss (n = 47)	p -value
10.36 (8.85)	16.70 (8.85)	0.00
11.80 (10.96)	20.62 (13.62)	0.00
10.96 (9.57)	18.18 (12.11)	0.00
7.68 (6.41)	11.11 (7.52)	0.02
8.11 (5.38)	11.36 (7.52)	0.01
15.77 (6.65)	14.33 (6.24)	0.30
33.16 (38.43)	63.69 (48.09)	0.00
	Stable Income         (n = 47)         10.36 (8.85)         11.80 (10.96)         10.96 (9.57)         7.68 (6.41)         8.11 (5.38)         15.77 (6.65)         33.16 (38.43)	Stable Income (n = 47)Economic Loss (n = 47)10.36 (8.85)16.70 (8.85)11.80 (10.96)20.62 (13.62)10.96 (9.57)18.18 (12.11)7.68 (6.41)11.11 (7.52)8.11 (5.38)11.36 (7.52)15.77 (6.65)14.33 (6.24)33.16 (38.43)63.69 (48.09)

### **Depression** Results **1.** Depression/Anxiety were not associated with the presence or absence of oil (p=.66, p=.17) **2.** Depression/Anxiety were associated with *income loss (p=.02, P=.01)* **3.** Clinically significant depression was found all groups (35% - 55%) and exceeded base rates (9.8-13%)

# **Coping Results**

1. Coping strategies was not impacted by the presence or absence of oil.

2. Income loss group was more likely to use *behavioral disengagement* as a coping strategy than the stable income group. **Resilience Results 1.** Most people were resilient (65%)

2. No difference between exposure groups (p=.59)

3. People with stable income were more resilient (p=.04) than those with income loss

# Health Symptoms or Complaints

# No difference from baseline in either economic group

Acute Phase: Study Conclusions **1. Psychological impact** to E Gulf communities was the most significant health impact. **2.** Psychological impact extended beyond areas of direct oil exposure **3. Income loss** after the spill may have a greater psychological health impact than the presence of oil on immediately adjacent shore.

# **Gulf Residents at Risk of** Mental Health Problems

N. uncertainty, unverifial

tude, doubtfulness, dubiou

ambivalence 518

vagueness, haziness, obscur

ness, mist, haze, for 423 operio

Yes and no, don't know, for

willation, indeterminaci

borderline case.

Uncertainty

- Job Security
- How will I support my family
- Is the fish and seafood safe to eat?
- Health Symptoms
- Future of the Gulf ecosystem

#### Patterns of Psychological Adjustment to Trauma (Bonanno, 2004)











# 6 Month Follow Up-Studies of Initial Cohort

• There was a significant decline in **Total Mood Disturbance in the** economically stable group. • There was a significant decline in denial for the economic loss group • There was a significant decline in use of emotional support in the economic loss group.

Study 1 and Study 2 Conclusions 1. Biggest impact: Psychologicial 2. Driven by: *Economic loss* **3.** Recovery Pattern: Depression/Acute Adjustment **Reaction evolved to Anxiety and** Anger. Less Denial and use of Emotional Support

# FUTURE DIRECTIONS

# **Resources** (Hobfoll, 1989)

#### Moderating Variables

#### **Outcome** (positive or negative)



Conservation of Resources Stress Model (Hobfoll, 1989)

Material
Energy
Interpersonal
Economic



## COMMUNITY PARTNERS

 Franklin's Promise Coalition, Joe Taylor
 Franklin Community Wellness and Mental Health Workgroup
 Bill Mahan, Franklin UF IFAS Extension Program
 Christy Crosby, Franklin County IFAS
 W. Stephen Otwell, Dept of Food Science and Human Nutrition, University of Florida
 Trinity Episcopal Church Eastpoint Church of God, FL
 Carrabelle City Hall, FL
 Darla Jones, Alabama Seafood Association
 Fisherman's Baptist Church, Foley AL

## Acknowledgments

Sparkle Roberts, Jacqui Kostelec, Patrick McLaughlin, Alexandra Toben, University of MD School of Medicine

W. Stephen Otwell, Dept of Food Science and Human Nutrition, University of Florida

NIEHS 5R01ES012459-05S1 and 1U19 ES02683-01 Health Impact of Deepwater Horizon Spill in Eastern Gulf Coast Communities