

WATER-RELATED INCIDENTS IN MARICOPA COUNTY, 2008

Annual Report for the Drowning Prevention Coalition of Arizona



**Arizona Department of Health Services
Bureau of Public Health Statistics**

September 28, 2009



Janice K. Brewer
Governor
State of Arizona

Will Humble
Interim Director
Arizona Department of Health Services

contact person:
Timothy J. Flood, M.D.
Bureau Medical Director
Arizona Department of Health Services
Bureau of Public Health Statistics
150 N 18th Avenue, Rm 550
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3248
(602) 542-7333

This report is prepared in support of the activities of the Drowning Prevention Coalition of Arizona

Suggested citation: Flood TJ. *Water-related incidents in Maricopa County, AZ, 2008.* Arizona Department of Health Services, Bureau of Public Health Statistics. Phoenix, AZ. September 2009.

This report can be made available in alternative format. Please contact the office listed above or call 1-800-367-8939 (TDD).

For an electronic version see <http://www.azdhs.gov/phs/phstats/meddir/>

Permission to quote from or reproduce materials from this publication is granted. Acknowledgment is appreciated.

WATER-RELATED INCIDENTS IN MARICOPA COUNTY, 2008

SUMMARY

This report describes water-related incidents that have activated the 9-1-1 emergency system. Data in this report are derived mainly from case reports submitted by fire departments in the Phoenix metropolitan area. In 2007 there were 82 serious water-related incidents that occurred in the metro area among persons of all ages. Children 0-4 years of age accounted for 43 of these incidents, 33 of which occurred in swimming pools. Of the 43 young children, 15 are known to have died (11 due to incidents occurring in pools). Of the remaining children, most survived the incident without apparent medical complications, but 2 children suffered an impairment. Although there has been a 87% increase in the number of young children who live in the county since 1990, the count of incidents in swimming pools has remained fairly constant since 1990.

Unlike June, July, and August of 2006 when there were no child deaths in pools, the summer of 2008 saw seven such deaths in pools. The Maricopa drowning death rate for children 0-4 years of age in 2008 rose slightly to 4.4 deaths per 100,000 children (in all bodies of water), but still it was among the lowest rate since we started tracking the problem. The rate of deaths in swimming pools also rose slightly to 3.5 deaths per 100,000 children. We believe that our combined, local, prevention efforts have led to this remarkable progress.

Emphasis on issues relating to supervision will have the greatest impact on nonfatal incidents, especially in the summertime. But, to prevent child drowning deaths (in contrast to incidents in which the child survives intact) continued attention needs to be paid to the placement of pool barriers, self-closing gates with latches, and their maintenance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
METHODS AND DATA SOURCE	4
FINDINGS	7
YOUNG CHILDREN.....	9
Outcomes	18
Attributed Cause.....	19
Comparison To Child Fatality Review Data	19
LIMITATIONS OF INCIDENCE DATA.....	22
DEATH CERTIFICATE DATA	23
DISCUSSION.....	25
INCIDENT REPORT FORM.....	26

INTRODUCTION

In the mid-1980's the drowning death rate of Arizona's preschoolers ranked first in the nation.¹ Warm weather, long summers, and the presence of more than 300,000 residential swimming pools make Arizona prone to water-related incidents. Furthermore, death is just one outcome of water-related incidents: in about 9% of incidents the child survives, albeit with some degree of neurological impairment.²


To address the problem of water-related incidents in the Phoenix metropolitan area (called "Maricopa County" in this report), the Drowning Prevention Coalition of Arizona was formed in 1988. This Coalition is comprised of municipal fire departments, hospitals, the state and county health departments, community organizations, pool builders, suppliers of pool safety equipment, parents of drowning victims, corporations, and others.

The following report presents the data collected for 2008, and compares the findings to those in previous years. Much of the report focuses on children under five years of age, and specifically on incidents occurring in swimming pools.

METHODS AND DATA SOURCE

The tracking of water related incidents occurs at several levels in the injury pyramid. The following analyses are based mainly upon incident reports submitted by responders at the local fire departments, shown as "FD" in the pyramid below.

Case Definition: In this report a water-related incident is defined as an incident in which a fire department responded to a 9-1-1 emergency call. We include in the analysis any incident in which the victim was given CPR, was not breathing, and was submerged or not struggling when retrieved from the water. (Some of these cases die



¹ Arizona Department of Health Services. Unintentional Drowning Deaths, Arizona, 1980-1989. Office of Planning & Health Status Monitoring, October 1990.

² Beyda, D. and Masuello, J. Phoenix Children's Hospital. Oral communication, July 1999.

the same day or at a later time; some fully recover.) We exclude from analysis any incident that did not appear to be life-threatening; for example, we exclude from analysis an incident in which a victim was struggling and did not require CPR.³

Procedures: Since 1988, the Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS) has monitored water-related incidents as reported by local fire departments. The fire departments usually are first on the scene of 9-1-1 calls and are generally able to provide information about the event from information provided by witnesses. We assume that very few serious incidents occur without activation of 9-1-1. The fire departments submit incident reports on a standard form (see attachment) developed in conjunction with the Coalition. The reported data items include the age and gender of the victim, the location of the incident, and the apparent circumstances surrounding the event. The ADHS Bureau of Public Health Statistics receives and analyzes these case forms.

So far, the data have not consistently included the calls to the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, which responds to incidents on the surrounding lakes, or the nearby Salt or Verde Rivers. These are popular recreational areas located just outside of the Phoenix metropolitan area. Incidents outside the metropolitan area are included sporadically.

Starting with the 2008 data the ADHS staff who enter data has been reduced to one person (TJF) who receives and codes the forms of each reported incident. Usually, fewer than six incidents per year are questionable as to whether the incident was life-threatening. Calls to 9-1-1 that are canceled are not submitted to ADHS. The surveillance system relies upon fire departments to report all the cases occurring within their jurisdictions.

Validation: In conjunction with the Coalition, the surveillance system searches the local newspaper (the Arizona Republic) daily for reports of water-related incidents. When found, articles are clipped and attached to the fire department reports. Rarely, there is no associated fire department report. If a report is missing, then ADHS contacts the fire department to request a submission. If the fire departments do not submit a case report, then we use the information from the newspaper clipping to create a case report. We use death certificates only to document the outcome status for incident cases reported by fire departments.⁴

³ These relatively minor 9-1-1 incidents that were excluded sometimes are called “dunkings, close calls, or near misses.” In recent years, the count of these minor incidents ranged from 22 to 54; in 2008 there were 41 such incidents. ADHS requests that fire departments submit all such incidents, but we exclude them from further analysis in the yearly reports. Obviously trivial incidents that would not even qualify as “dunkings” are not submitted by most fire departments.


⁴ We do not use death certificates to supplement the count of incidents reported by fire departments. However, as explained in a later section, we use death statistics as an independent method of tracking drowning trends.

Analysis: Analysis of data is performed using Microsoft Access on the database of the 2,700 records entered since 1988. The minor (non life-threatening) incidents,³ also called “dunkings”, are excluded from all subsequent analyses reported herein.

FINDINGS

In 2008, fire departments and the newspaper reported 82 serious water-related incidents in Maricopa County among persons of all ages. Twelve incidents in 2008 were reported only in the newspaper, an increase of 6 incidents from previous years. The count of 82 serious incidents in 2008 was among the lowest annual counts reported since 1990 (see Figure A).

Figure A. Count of reported, serious water-related incidents among persons of all ages in all bodies of water. An incident may lead to an outcome of death, or survival with impairment or no impairment.



The distribution of the 82 incidents in 2008 according to the city and age of the victim is shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Water-related incidents reported for 2008 according to age group and city of incident in Maricopa County. Only life threatening incidents are included in the analysis.

City of Incident	Years of Age of the Victim					Unknown	Total
	0-4	5-14	15-34	35-64	65+		
Chandler				1			1
Gilbert	4	1	1	1			7
Glendale	3						3
Mesa	4		3	1	1		9
Paradise Valley	1						1
Peoria	1						1
Phoenix	23	4	5	7	5		44
Queen Creek	1						1
Maricopa Co, rural	1		2	1	1		5
Scottsdale	1		1	2			4
Sun City	1						1
Surprise	1		1		1		3
Tempe	2						2
All Areas	43	5	13	13	8	0	82

The body of water of the incidents according to age group is presented in **Table 2**. Most incidents took place in pools. Pools, either above ground or in ground, were involved in 60 (73.2%) of the 82 events. Thirty-three of the 60 incidents in pools involved children aged 0-4 years. Bathtubs (10 incidents), spas (7 incidents), rivers and lakes (3 incidents), and canals (2 incidents) were the next most common places for water-related incidents among all ages. No incidents occurred in buckets or in above ground pools. Five serious incidents in 2008 involved pre-schoolers who submerged in bathtubs.

Table 2. Water type by age group, 2008. Only life threatening incidents are included in the analysis.

Water type	Years of Age of the Victim						Total
	0-4	5-14	15-34	35-64	65+	UNK	
Bathtub	5		1	3	1		10
Bucket							
Canal/Irrigation Ditch	2						2
Fish/Decorative Pond							
Other							
Pool, in ground	33	4	9	7	7		60
Pool, above ground							
River/Lake			2	1			3
Spa	3	1	1	2			7
Toilet							
Unknown							
Missing							
All water bodies	43	5	13	13	8	0	82

Young Children

Children, ages 0-4 years, comprised the largest group experiencing a water-related incident. Although older individuals are equally important to consider in terms of loss of life, society generally feels a greater sense of responsibility to prevent injury to persons in the youngest, highly vulnerable, age group. The remainder of this report analyzes the findings among the 0-4 year old age group.

Some data elements were not collected in the early years of our surveillance, and space considerations make it difficult to include all years of data. For those reasons, the graphs that follow may display a variety of time periods. For a few, selected graphs we display data according to the child's outcome: died; survived but with impairment; and survived in apparently normal condition.

The distribution of cases among single ages of the 0-4 year old group is shown in **Figure 1**. Among children 1-4 years old, the count of incidents in swimming pools far overshadows the count in all other bodies of water combined. Among infants (i.e., under one year of age) bathtubs are the most common water body in which incidents occur. **Figure 1b** shows the count when the outcome was death or impairment.

Figure 1. Count of incidents according to the body of water in which life threatening incidents occurred, by single age category, reported in Maricopa County, 1990-2008. Outcome status: all.





Figure 1b. Count of incidents according to the body of water in which the incident occurred, 1990-2008, where the child's outcome was death or impairment.



The next tables and figures provide information about incidents occurring in swimming pools for this age group. **Figure 2** shows the count of pool-related incidents reported over the previous 21 years. In 2008, the count (33) decreased noticeably compared to the count of 45 in 2007. Because of the increasing population of children residing in the metro area (from 170 182 resident children in 1990 to 318 634 in 2008 – an 87% increase), **Figure 3** displays the rate of pool incidents, expressed per 100,000 children residing in Maricopa County. The rate of 10.4 for 2008 is the lowest rate on record. The inverse of this rate for 2008 (100,000 / 10.4) reveals that for every 9,615 children, one child experienced a life-threatening pool incident in Maricopa county.

Figure 2. Count of life-threatening incidents in pools, by year, among 0-4 year olds. Outcome status: all.





Figure 3. Rate (per 100,000 children aged 0-4) of life threatening pool incidents occurring in Maricopa County. The rates consider the increasing population of children in the county. The numerators for the rates are the counts of incidents (shown in Figure 2) regardless of the county in which the child resided. Outcome status: all.



The occurrence of incidents by month is shown in **Figure 4**. We note the typical pattern seen in previous years, with the number of pool-related incidents peaking during the summer months of June, July, and August. Again in 2008 the counts in June and July were below our short-term goal of seeing fewer than 10 incidents in any month. In 2006 the fire departments reported not a single pool-related death all summer. Remarkably, in 2008 there were no fatal pool incidents in the colder months (see **Figure 4b**).

Figure 4. Monthly sum of life-threatening swimming pool incidents, 0-4 year olds, Maricopa County. Outcomes: all.





Figure 4b. Monthly count of incidents in pools in which the child's outcome was "died."



Source: DPCCA Fire Depts and newsclippings.

As shown in **Table 3**, boys comprised a majority of the pool-related victims in 2008. This finding has been present in most years.

Table 3. Gender of 45 children, 0-4 years old, involved in pool-related incidents, 2008. Outcome: all.

Gender	Count	(%)
Male	22	65%
Female	12	35%

Race and ethnicity are difficult variables to analyze because of the way that Hispanic ethnicity is often mistakenly considered a race group. Currently, most demographers consider Hispanic as an ethnic group, not a race group. For analysis here, we count Whites as either Hispanic or non Hispanic. The remaining races are counted regardless of Hispanic ethnicity. A tabulation of the available data is presented in **Table 4**.

Table 4. Race and ethnic characteristics of children, 0-4 years of age, involved in water-related incidents in pools in 2008. Outcome: all.

Race/Ethnicity	Count	%
Asian	1	3.0%
American Indian	0	0.0%
Black	2	6.1%
Hispanic	6	18.2%
White, non Hispanic	12	36.4%
Other	0	0.0%
Unknown	12	36.4%
TOTAL	33	100.0%

The 2000 Census found that 40.1% of children age 0-4 residing in Maricopa County were Hispanic.⁵ Furthermore, starting in 2003 the number of births to Hispanic mothers has exceeded that of Whites.⁶ The proportion of Hispanic families that actually have pools is not known, but is probably less than the population as a whole.

⁵ To calculate the percentage of Hispanic children in Maricopa County, the numerator was derived from the U.S. Census Bureau at <http://factfinder.census.gov/> and the denominator was derived from the Arizona Department of Economic Security's Population Statistics at <http://www.de.state.az.us/>

⁶ Arizona Health Status and Vital Statistics, 2005. page 10. ADHS, Sept 2006.

Table 5 presents the incidents according to the body of water and the site of the 33 incidents involving children between the ages of 0 and 4. The most common site of incidence was a pool located at the victim's home (24 incidents). In three incidents the site was unknown. Three incidents occurred at a relative's pool. One incident occurred in the pool at a friend's home. The five bathtub incidents all occurred at the victim's home. Two of the spa incidents occurred at the victim's home, and one at a relative's home.

Table 5. The body of water according to the site of incident for children, 0-4 years of age. Life-threatening incidents only, Maricopa County, 2008. Outcomes: all.

Body of Water	Friend's Home	Neighbor's Home	Public & Semi-pub	Relative's Home	Victim's Home	Other / Unknown	All Sites
Bathtub					5		5
Bucket							
Canal/Irrigation Ditch					1	1	2
Fish/Decorative Pond							
Pool, above ground							
Pool, in ground	1		2	3	24	3	33
River/Lake							
Spa				1	2		3
Toilet							
Other/ Unknown/ Missing							
TOTAL	1	0	2	5	32	4	43


Table 6 presents the type of dwelling where the incidents took place. Twenty-three (70%) of the 33 pool incidents occurred at a single family home. Seven of the 33 pool incidents occurred in apartments or condominiums in 2008. In past years, apartments were the location of most bathtub incidents; this year three bathtub incidents occurred in apartments and two occurred in single homes.

Table 6. The body of water according to the type of dwelling for children, 0-4 years of age, who experienced a water-related incident in 2008. Outcomes: all.

Body of Water	Apt/ Condo	Hotel/ Motel	Single Home	Multiple Units	Trailer/ Mobile	Unknown/ Other/NA	Total
Bathtub	3		2				5
Bucket							0
Canal/Irrigation Ditch			1			1	2
Fish/Decorative Pond							0
Pool, above ground							0
Pool, in ground	7		23			3	33
River/Lake							0
Spa	1		2				3
Toilet							0
Other/Unknown							0
Total	11	0	28	0	0	4	43

Figure 5 displays the occurrence of pool-related incidents by day of week. Incidents occurred on every day of the week, and there was no day when vigilance would not have been important. The graph shows that pool incidents tend to occur more often during the weekend.

Figure 5. Day of the week of life-threatening pool incidents among children 0-4 years old, Maricopa County, 1990-2008. Outcomes: all.



The distribution of pool incidents by hour of the day is shown in Figure 6. Not surprisingly, the incidents occurred when children were likely to be awake. The peak time for an incident in the 0-4 year old age group was in the mid to late afternoon.

Figure 6. Life threatening pool-related incidents by hour of the day among children 0-4 years of age. Cumulative count, 1990-2008, Maricopa County. Outcomes: all.




Table 7 presents information about the type of clothing worn at the time of a pool-related incident. In at least 70% of the cases, the children were not wearing swimming attire. These incidents did not occur in a swimming situation; rather, they occurred at a time when the children were not expected to be in or near the pool.


A major purpose of this surveillance system is the identification of the factors surrounding water-related incidents in young children. To assist in this effort, the personnel from the responding fire departments attempt to determine the apparent circumstances surrounding each event. In gathering this data, a firefighter asks about supervision at the time of the incident and looks for breaches in layers of protection that likely allowed a young child to access the pool.

Information about the supervisor of the victim at the time of incident is shown in Figure 7. Over the past 17 years, a mother or father or both was supervising the child in 543 (65%) of the 839 life-threatening incidents involving children 0-4 years old. In 296 (35%) incidents, the supervisor was someone other than the child's parent. This seems to be a higher proportion than the amount of time that children in this young age group spend outside the supervision of a parent. Thus, babysitters, grandparents, and other supervisors also need to be even more alert to the potential for a pool-related incident to occur.

Table 7. Clothing worn by children ages 0-4 who experienced a life threatening water related incident in a pool, 2008. Outcomes: all.

None	2	6.1%
Swimwear	13	39.4%
Other clothes	10	30.3%
Unknown	8	24.2%
Total	33	100.0%

Figure 7. Cumulative count of presumed supervisor in life-threatening pool incidents involving children, age 0-4, 1992-2008. Outcomes: all.



Outcomes

To determine outcomes, we used data from fire departments, and supplemented it with data from death certificates and other sources. We documented that at least 15 of the 43 young children (0-4 years old) who experienced a serious water-related incident in 2008

have died (see **Table 8**). Eleven children died from incidents in pools. Two children died from incidents in spas, and one child each died following incidents in a bathtub and irrigation canal. Of the 43 children, 24 had no reported impairment when released from the hospital. But, there

Table 8. Outcome status of children 0-4 years of age reported as having a life-threatening water related incident in 2008.

Water type	Outcome Status				Total
	Unknown	Died	Impairment	No Impairment	
Bathtub		1	1	3	5
Bucket					0
Canal/Irrigation Ditch		1		1	2
Fish/Decorative Pond					0
Other & Unknown					0
Pool, above ground					0
Pool, in ground	1	11	1	20	33
River/Lake					0
Spa	1	2			3
Total	2	15	2	24	43

were two documented or presumed cases of neurological impairment in this age group in 2008; this is the approximate number we have seen in previous years.

Concerns about confidentiality make it difficult to document the outcome of cases that enter the medical care system. The outcome status of 2 of the 43 children was unknown. Our linkage to hospital discharge records allows assignment of an outcome status to many cases that the fire fighters have not been able to follow up. Since firefighters try to obtain the follow-up status on cases which have not responded to their resuscitative efforts, we speculate that in most cases a follow-up status of “unknown” means that the child probably recovered well.

The narrative section of the incident report form often provides additional information concerning the incident. This narrative section reveals that a family member or other person often resuscitated the child at the scene by promptly administering CPR when the child was pulled from the water. It is our belief that this immediate resuscitation is a vital step in stabilizing the child and counteracting the detrimental effects of the submersion. However, we cannot determine whether prompt CPR leads to the survival in a vegetative state of some children who otherwise would have died.

Attributed Cause

Upon review of the incident form, we assign a single, “attributed cause” of each pool incident to one of the following six categories:

- No barrier to pool
- Inadequate fence
- Gate or latch failed or was propped open
- Back safety door or latch failed
- Supervision issue
- Other or unknown.

This information is further classified into events that occurred during the seven “cold” months, October through April, and the five “warm” months, May through September.

Comparison To Child Fatality Review Data


The findings in our analysis are similar to that of the Arizona Child Fatality Review (CFR) Program. The CFR program has published their findings of drowning of young children, 1995-1999, and reported that only 4 of 81 drowning **deaths** of children less than 5 years of age occurred in backyard pools in which it was known that there was an adequate pool fence that had a properly functioning locked gate.⁷

A comparable analysis of our data, looking specifically at the children who died or were impaired, yields similar findings. To relate the incidence data reported by fire departments to the mortality data from CFR, we combined the categories of the 122 incidents occurring between 2000 and 2008 where the child’s outcome was “died (108) or impaired (14).” For additional comparison, we also analyzed the combined category of 289 incidents where the outcome was “normal (177) or unknown (112).” As in previous reports, we display the findings according to season (warm or cold). The results are shown in the four pie charts of **Figure 8**.

⁷ Rimza ME, Schackner RA, Bowen KA, Marshall W. Can Child Deaths Be Prevented? The Arizona Child Fatality Review Program Experience. *Pediatrics*. 2002; 110(1). www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/110/1/e11

Figure 8. Comparison of the single attributed cause of incidents in pools, according to time of year (cold vs warm months) and outcome of the child (normal and unknown vs. died and impaired). This figure analyzes cases occurring in 2000-2008. Data are derived from reports submitted by fire departments in Maricopa County.

Attributed cause in pools, children under 5 years of age, Maricopa County, 2000-2008





N:\chronic\down\yr2008\00-08attrib 4 pies.pr4

This approach reveals a notable finding for incidents that occurred during the warm months. The roles of supervision and barriers differ for the outcome categories. The role of barriers (absent or failed) for cases whose outcome is “died or impaired” markedly differs compared to those cases whose outcome is “normal or unknown.” Absent barriers appear to be a significantly more prominent factor in cases where the child died or was impaired than is supervision. On the other hand, supervision is the predominant factor in warm month incidents in which the child survived with normal or unknown outcome. In cold months, **Figure 8** shows that a barrier is the major factor regardless of outcome. The data here support the findings of the CFRT regarding the role of inadequate barriers as a major factor that contributes to child drownings in swimming pools.

Figures 9a and 9b present data on the trend of the attributed cause of pool-related incidents over the 17-year period. As noted above, the attributable cause is best analyzed by excluding cases in which the outcome is “normal” or “unknown.” An interesting and probably more relevant pattern is noted by analyzing the cases where the child’s outcome is death or impairment. Approximately 10 deaths occurred annually from pool incidents in warm months, and about 5 deaths annually from incidents that occurred in cold months (see Figure 4b). The counts swing widely from year-to-year because the counts are relatively small. We could not discern a trend in the count of attributed causes in warm months. Similarly, for events occurring in cold months (see next page) we hesitate to draw conclusions about a time trend because the counts are so small and year-to-year variability so great.

Figures 9a (warm) and 9b (cold). Trend of attributed causes (expressed as the count of all cases in the warm or cold season) of pool incidents in Maricopa County involving children 0-4 years of age in which the outcome of the incident was death or impairment. The graphs do not show the counts of the few cases attributable to “Inadequate barrier” and “Other/Unknown.”





LIMITATIONS OF INCIDENCE DATA

Our surveillance system relies mainly upon voluntary reporting by fire departments and is subject to underreporting if they reduce their participation in submitting the report forms. The downturn in the economy and municipal revenues in 2008 and cutbacks in staff at fire departments clearly can affect the ability to report cases.

The surveillance system assumes that few serious water-related incidents occur without the activation of the 9-1-1 system. However, this assumption has not been rigorously tested. In a future reporting period we intend to compare our findings to the counts of cases seen at hospital emergency departments. Cases that generally lack a fire department report include those that are obviously dead when the law enforcement responders arrive on scene, crime scene cases, and cases under the jurisdiction of the sheriff's office or a tribal government.

Information from death certificates (described below) reveals that no child drownings in 2008 were missed by the reports we received from fire departments or from news clippings.⁸ The incidence surveillance data recorded the 15 deaths of children in this age group. This actually is one *more* case than would be found by querying the statistical death file.

⁸ For consistency with methods used in previous years, we do not add missed cases to the surveillance database.

DEATH CERTIFICATE DATA

Death certificates provide an independent data source to measure the counts, rates, and trend of child drownings. While we use information from death certificates to supplement the outcome status of cases identified through fire department reports (described above), we do not add otherwise unreported drowning cases to the incidence database. Thus, the mortality data can help to measure the accuracy and completeness of the incidence surveillance system for the cases which die.

Customarily, mortality data show deaths of the resident population during a given year. However, for this report we present an unconventional analysis that more precisely reflects the local, year-to-year findings. We reviewed Arizona death statistics to find child cases who died in Maricopa County, regardless of where they resided. We include only the cases whose incident occurred in Maricopa County and whose death occurred in Arizona. In addition, because some deaths occur months or years after a near-drowning injury, this special analysis displays information about the decedents according to the year of their injury (not the customary year of their death). Thus, we present the local rates of drowning deaths, regardless of residency, according to the year of the incident. To calculate the mortality rate, we divided the count by the estimated number of children age 0-4 each year residing in Maricopa county. This method improves the accuracy of identifying the year of the injury event; this is important for the Coalition that needs yearly feedback about the effectiveness of their prevention programs. But, we must acknowledge the methodology under-represents catastrophic incidents occurring in recent years if a child's death is simply delayed; obviously, these cases would not yet be shown because they have not died.

Figure 10 shows these drowning death rates for children under five years of age.⁹ The data are shown for drownings in all bodies of water, and separately for drownings that occurred in swimming pools (including spas), and in bodies of water other than pools and spas.¹⁰

In 2008 and 2007, there were no death cases who had sustained an injury in a prior year.

In 2008, the Maricopa drowning rate for all bodies of water increased slightly to 4.4 deaths per 100,000 resident children. Still, this is the third lowest drowning rate since we began tracking the rates. Similarly, the death rate for pools increased to 3.5 per 100,000 children, also a comparatively low rate during the past 27 years. The overall decline in the pool death rate looks generally similar to the decline in the rate of


⁹ To calculate this rate, the numerator includes non-residents and Arizona residents, age 0-4 years old, whose death occurred in Maricopa County. The denominator, however, is the Maricopa County population of children 0-4 years old. We chose this unconventional method for calculating the rate because we occasionally encounter nonresident visitors whose incident and death occurred in Maricopa county. We count these cases because the Drowning Prevention Coalition is focused on reducing the local incidents regardless of whether the child is a county resident or a visitor.

¹⁰ We consider a hot tub or spa in the same category as swimming pool.

pool incidents reported by the fire departments shown previously in **Figure 3**. For comparison, the goal of *Healthy Arizona 2010* is to reduce drowning fatalities to no more than 0.9 deaths per 100,000 young children.^{11,12}

Figure 10. Drowning death rate for children, 0-4 years of age, where the occurrence of the death and the incident was in Maricopa County. [Data Source: ADHS, Vital Statistics, death certificates coded with underlying cause of death as: E830, E832, or E910 (prior to year 2000); or W65-W74, V90-V92, or Y21 (year 2000 and later). Manner of death: accidental or undetermined].

Child drowning rate and count in Maricopa County, Arizona Deaths following incidents in 1980-2008; 0-4 years of age



¹¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2010*, 2nd ed., Volume 2. Injury Prevention, Section 15-29: Reduce Drownings, page 15-40. U.S. Government Printing Office, November 2000.

¹² <http://www.azdhs.gov/bems/trauma-pdf/injuryprevplan.pdf> ADHS Injury Surveillance and Prevention Plan, 2002-2005.

DISCUSSION

The rates of incidents and deaths in pools in Maricopa county for 2008 remain among the lowest on record. Informal conversations with the Board of the Drowning Prevention Coalition of Arizona have not identified specific factors that have produced this favorable trend. However, we believe that a combination of factors contributes to this trend: awareness campaigns sponsored by private and public sectors; intense media support in reporting individual incidents; widely publicized prosecution of cases of gross negligence; prompt use of CPR; and the slowly accumulating, favorable impact of pool barrier laws passed in the early 1990s. Further reduction of the drowning death rate could be achieved through wider use of barriers (eg, fences) and working gates.

In 2009 a scientific article was published that showed a reduced risk of drowning among children age 1-4 years who received formal swim lessons compared to those children who had not received such lessons.¹³ The Maricopa surveillance system does not determine the swimming ability of the young children. The Coalition may wish to consider adding this factor to the data collected locally.

¹³ Brenner RA, Taneja GS, Haynie DL, et al. Association between swimming lessons and drowning in childhood. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* March 2009; 163(3):203-210.

INCIDENT REPORT FORM: DROWNING OR NEAR-DROWNING IN ARIZONA – 2008

DATE OF INCIDENT
(MM/DD/YR)

HOUR
(24:00)

AGE
(yrs)

SEX

INCIDENT # _____
PLAT or ZIP CODE _____

FIRE DEPT.

(Reporting agency)

CITY OF INCIDENT:

- Chandler Mesa Rural area
- Gilbert Peoria Scottsdale
- Glendale Phoenix Tempe
- Other: _____

RACE/ETHN:

- Hispanic White Amer. Indian
- Black Asian/PI Unknown
- Other: _____

WATER TYPE:

- Pool--in ground Spa
- Pool--above ground Bathtub
- Canal or Irrigation Ditch Bucket
- Lake Other: _____

AT WHOSE HOME DID INCIDENT OCCUR:

- Victim's Home Neighbor's
- Relative's Friend's
- Not at a home _____

TYPE OF DWELLING OR FACILITY:

- Single Home Apt/Condo
- Hotel/Motel Other: _____

ATTIRE OF VICTIM:

- Swimwear Other Clothes
- None Other Clothes

PATIENT'S ACTIVITY AND LOCATION IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO INCIDENT:

- Swimming Playing inside
- Bathing Playing outside
- Other: _____

CHILD SUPERVISION AT TIME OF INCIDENT:

- Mother Father N/A
- Other (Specify) _____

SUPERVISOR'S ACTIVITY PRIOR TO INCIDENT:

- Sleeping Watching TV On phone
- Yard work Housework Other: _____

STATUS OF PATIENT WHEN FOUND IN WATER:

- Submerged Floating
- Struggling Unknown
- Other: _____

RESPIRATORY EFFORT WHEN PULLED FROM WATER:

- Present Absent

ESTIMATED DURATION OF ANOXIA: _____

RESCUER(S) ACTIONS PRIOR TO FD ARRIVAL:

- Chest compressions AND breaths (CPR)
- Chest compressions only
- Rescue breaths only
- None attempted Unknown

For pool incidents at dwellings AND patient < 6 y/o:

BARRIER

IS IT PRESENT?

- Fence between house and pool Yes No
- Gates Self-Close with Latch Yes No
- Gates Work Properly Yes No
- House Doors Self-Close with Latch Yes No
- Doors Work Properly Yes No
- Pool Cover, Type: _____ Yes No
- Door or Window Alarm Yes No

LIKELY METHOD OF ACCESS TO POOL OR SPA:

- Supervisor allowed child into pool or deck area
- No barrier -- child wandered in
- Climbed (specify): _____
- Child entered unsecured or propped gate
- Other: _____

DISPOSITION (if known):

- D.O.A.
- Transported to: _____
- Died in E.D. Admitted
- Treated as outpatient and released
- P.O.V. transport to: _____
- Evaluated and left on-scene

FOLLOW-UP & DATE PATIENT WAS LAST SEEN:

- Died _____ / _____ / _____
- No Impairment _____ / _____ / _____
- Impairment _____ / _____ / _____

DESCRIBE THE APPARENT CIRCUMSTANCES (how/why it happened; how child was found & revived): _____

(Initials)

(Today's Date)