

## FINAL REPORT

# Mapping the Movement for Healthy Food and Activity Environments in the United States: A Snapshot of the Field

*Funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation  
and prepared by Prevention Institute*

*Principal author:*

Manal J. Aboelata, MPH

*Contributors:*

Leslie Mikkelsen, RD, MPH

Janani Srikantharajah

Sarah Adler-McDonald

© January 2008

*Prevention Institute is a nonprofit, national center dedicated to improving community health and well-being by building momentum for effective primary prevention. Primary prevention means taking action to build resilience and to prevent problems before they occur. The Institute's work is characterized by a strong commitment to community participation and promotion of equitable health outcomes among all social and economic groups. Since its founding in 1997, the organization has focused on injury and violence prevention, traffic safety, health disparities, nutrition and physical activity, and youth development. This, and other Prevention Institute documents, are available at no cost on our website.*

221 Oak Street  
Oakland, CA 94607  
510.444.7738  
fax 510.663.1280

[www.preventioninstitute.org](http://www.preventioninstitute.org)

Prevention  
and equity | **Institute**  
at the center of community well-being

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
Purpose . . . . .	1
What’s in this report? . . . . .	1
Our approach . . . . .	2
Deliverables and outcomes . . . . .	2
<b>Framework for The Snapshot</b> . . . . .	<b>2</b>
Challenges and Limitations . . . . .	3
<b>Overview of Findings</b> . . . . .	<b>4</b>
Overview of policy-oriented groups . . . . .	4
Overview of “poised” groups . . . . .	4
Overview of groups characterized as having a primary focus on education or program delivery . . . . .	4
Table 1: Characterization of interviewed organizations . . . . .	5
<b>Findings: Issues and Opportunities for Building a National Movement to Prevent Childhood Obesity: Observations</b> . . . . .	<b>7</b>
Overarching observations . . . . .	7
Observations by US Health and Human Service Regions . . . . .	9
Observations about multi-site initiatives . . . . .	9
Table 2: Overview of Regions (US Health and Human Service Regions) . . . . .	10
Major observations about groups engaged in multi-site funding initiatives . . . . .	12
<b>Implications and Next Steps: Building on The Snapshot</b> . . . . .	<b>13</b>
Potential next steps . . . . .	14
 <b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>Appendix A. Key Informant Organizations</b> . . . . .	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix B. Mapping Code Book</b>	
Table 1: Contact information . . . . .	16
Table 2: Interview information . . . . .	17
Table 3: Mapping Characterization . . . . .	18
Table 4: Organization information . . . . .	20
<b>Appendix C. Definitions and Examples of Policy Domains</b> . . . . .	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix D. Organizations by Policy Characterization</b>	
Table 1: Policy-focused groups . . . . .	24
Table 2. Groups characterized as “poised” for policy and environmental change . . . . .	46
Table 3. Groups characterized as having a primary focus on education or program delivery . . . . .	62



# Mapping the Movement for Healthy Food and Activity Environments in the United States: A Snapshot of the Field

## Final Report

### INTRODUCTION

*Mapping the Movement for Healthy Food and Activity Environments in the United States: A Snapshot of the Field* presents a scan of efforts across the country relevant to advancing a movement to prevent childhood obesity in the United States. *The Snapshot* highlights current efforts and points to potential areas for future investment, with a particular focus on policy advocacy and environmental change work in communities of color and in low-income neighborhoods.

### PURPOSE

In alignment with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) commitment to improving access to healthy choices by changing policies, environments, and social norms, *The Snapshot* focuses on groups working to transform communities through policy advocacy and environmental change. Beginning in December 2006, Prevention Institute initiated a search for major coalitions and organizations engaged in nutrition and physical activity advocacy and related efforts (e.g., food security, sustainable agriculture, and the built environment). The scan also includes local grassroots organizations advocating to limit unhealthy exposures (e.g., tobacco, alcohol, and environmental toxins) or to expand human rights (e.g., labor and housing rights groups) in order to identify interest and capacity among such groups to engage in childhood obesity prevention. The goal of *The Snapshot* is to provide RWJF's Childhood Obesity Team with valuable data as it rolls out its national initiative to reduce childhood obesity rates by 2015.

### WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT

This report describes Prevention Institute's findings and observations from discussions with key informants and interviews with 312 advocacy organizations from across the US.

- **Our Approach** describes Prevention Institute's data collection methods.
- **Deliverables and Outcomes** delineates the primary products associated with this project.
- **Framework for *The Snapshot*** explains why we focused this project on grassroots advocacy groups.
- **Challenges and Limitations** describes barriers encountered by interviewers during data collection efforts.
- **Overview of Findings** encapsulates major themes that emerged from the interviews and summarizes common characteristics of the interviewed groups.
- **Issues and Opportunities for Building a National Movement to Prevent Childhood Obesity—Observations** articulates observations from interviews and highlights recurring themes.
  - ❖ **US HHS Regions** gives special attention to interview findings within Health and Human Services Regions.
  - ❖ **Multi-site Initiatives** synthesizes observations about multi-site funding initiatives and the role that national funding streams seem to have in shaping and advancing advocacy efforts.
- **Building on *The Snapshot*—Implications and Potential Next Steps** draws implications from observations and findings, lays out possible areas for further research, and offers ideas to build upon the data in *The Snapshot*.

- **Appendices.** Four appendices follow the body of this report: 1) list of key informants, 2) description of the codebook for data entry, 3) definitions of policy domains and 4) three tables that include names of interviewed groups according to their level of engagement in policy advocacy.

## OUR APPROACH

Through targeted outreach, key informant interviews, and snowball sampling, Prevention Institute identified groups working in (and with) communities of color and low-income communities to improve conditions for healthy eating and physical activity. We also sought out groups working on issues such as alcohol control, tobacco prevention, and environmental justice. Based on brief, open-ended interviews with key informants and organizational contacts, Prevention Institute produced a database that describes organizational efforts, key issues, and policy priorities. (For a list of key informant organizations, see Appendix A.) Interview data was entered into a Filemaker Pro database and then converted into Microsoft Access for RWJF’s Childhood Obesity Team. A full description of the database is included in Appendix B and definitions of policy domains are included in Appendix C. Using internally developed criteria, a project team of interviewers and the project director characterized each interviewed group along several dimensions, including the following:

- Level of focus on policy and environmental change (as opposed to educational or programmatic focus)
- Level of focus on equity (emphasis on eliminating disparity)
- Policy target (environmental or institutional change vs. health care reimbursement, for example)

An internet-based, clickable map created from the street address (when available), city, and zip code of each interviewed group provides a visual representation of the groups interviewed along with the organizational names and brief descriptions of each interviewed group. The maps can be accessed at:

- <http://tinyurl.com/2byab8> for Policy groups
- <http://tinyurl.com/275log> for “Poised” groups
- <http://tinyurl.com/2bsmyb> for Education groups

## DELIVERABLES AND OUTCOMES

In addition to this Final Report, the primary deliverables associated with *Mapping the Movement for Healthy Food and Activity Environments in the United States* include the following:

1. A database describing the 312 organizations interviewed (Filemaker Pro and Microsoft Access);
2. A set of 11 program profiles describing organizational efforts to improve policies and community environments. These groups were profiled because they are archetypes of the kinds of efforts that contribute to the movement to prevent childhood obesity
3. An internet-based map of interviewed groups

## FRAMEWORK FOR THE SNAPSHOT

A wide variety of strategies and interventions can potentially reduce childhood obesity rates. Healthy eating and activity behaviors underlie obesity and many chronic illnesses such as Type 2 Diabetes, hypertension, cardiovascular disease, and several types of cancer. As stated by the Institute of Medicine, “it is unreasonable to expect that people will change their behavior easily when there are so many forces in the social, cultural, and physical environment which conspire against such change.” Therefore, Prevention Institute focused our research on coalitions and organizations working to transform environments, policies, and social norms.

*The Snapshot* emphasizes groups with a stated focus on limiting access to unhealthy exposures (tobacco, alcohol, pesticides, lead, etc.) or improving access to healthy options (e.g., increasing park availability or access to fruits and vegetables) through changes to the physical environment. We also examined efforts with an explicit goal of influencing local, state, and (in a limited number of cases) federal policy because environmental and policy change represent critical levers for supporting healthy eating and activity behaviors.

For the purposes of this scan, we defined groups as engaged in policy or environmental change if they 1) possessed a track record for influencing policy and 2)

articulated policy or community change priorities. Policy advocacy and environmental change activities do not exclude individual skill-building or community education strategies. Indeed, building community awareness and increasing capacity of individuals can support policy advocacy and community change. However, when the primary activities of a group were aimed at changing individual behaviors through education-only approaches, Prevention Institute defined the group as having an educational or programmatic focus. Because groups focused on individual education and behavior change strategies were not of primary interest, the analysis that follows focuses on policy advocacy and environmental change efforts.

Policy advocacy and community organizing in low-income communities and communities of color represent important skill sets for building momentum for change in disadvantaged populations. Prevention Institute examined workers' rights efforts, housing advocacy groups, and tobacco prevention and alcohol control policy coalitions. The purpose of having conversations with advocacy groups working on issues beyond food and activity was to better understand how that work creates potential synergies and opportunities for alignment with childhood obesity prevention.

Given disproportionate rates of childhood obesity among low-income people and people of color, we sought to interview representatives from coalitions and groups working in (and with) low-income African American, Latino, Native American/Tribal populations, and, to a lesser extent, Asian Pacific Islander groups. We attempted to define whether or not groups were working in urban or rural settings and identify the extent to which efforts focused on eliminating disparities and improving equity.

## CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

**BREADTH VERSUS DEPTH:** In our efforts to scan the country and identify groups in all 50 states, we interviewed a broad geographic cross-section at the expense of drilling deeply in any one locale. In states with a lot of activism around policy advocacy and environmental change, such as California, Georgia, or New York, this meant that we only interviewed a small

proportion of potential groups. In states with a limited base of advocacy groups, such as Alabama or Nevada, staying broad meant that we attempted many calls to identify a relatively small number of groups. In both scenarios, additional effort, time, and resources would be needed to capture a more extensive account of all possible groups working to improve community health.

**CONTACTING GROUPS IN SOUTHERN STATES:** It was generally difficult to contact groups in the South, especially local grassroots groups. Many groups did not have websites, lacked working phone numbers, or the organization had closed. A number of groups in the South were also ultimately considered "non-responsive." That is, after at least four separate attempts to call a group (during different days, weeks and times of day), interviewers moved on to other groups. Interviewers also attempted to contact many statewide groups in the South, especially "alcohol, tobacco and other drug" groups, but many were unresponsive. This may have been due to time of day, time of year, or may reflect small/overworked staff. Many of the people we ultimately contacted indicated that they had other full-time jobs so they may not have had much time to focus on the advocacy work that we were interested in.

**A POINT IN TIME:** Based on brief (30–45 minute) conversations with site representatives, interviewers gleaned information about opportunities for capacity-building, networks and partnerships, and interest and ability to align with childhood obesity prevention. Further research might be warranted to look more systematically at how groups' work has progressed over time, assess capacity-building needs, and evaluate their approaches. In particular, for groups that indicated that they were just getting started, follow-up discussion would clarify progress.

## OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Prevention Institute identified over 400 community-based organizations, coalitions, government-based and academic-based initiatives in all 50 states. We conducted brief interviews with 312 groups representing every state. Prevention Institute staff characterized 152 groups (49%) as being deeply engaged in policy and environmental change strategies, 114 groups (37%) as being “poised” to engage more fully in policy and environmental change work, and the remaining 46 groups (15%) were characterized as having a primary focus on education or programmatic approaches to community health. Of the 312 groups interviewed, 164 (52%) indicated an explicit focus on improving equity and eliminating racial/ethnic health (or other) disparities.

Table 1 provides the breakdown of groups by organizational characteristics.

### OVERVIEW OF POLICY-ORIENTED GROUPS

Appendix D, Table 1 contains a listing of 152 groups defined as having a primary focus on policy and/or environmental change. *These groups were savvy about policy formulation at local, state, or federal levels or provided significant leadership to improve social or physical environments. Organizations and coalitions in this category represent potentially important hubs of activism in their geographical and topical areas of involvement.*

Policy and Environmental Change groups differed with respect to key issue areas and policy priorities; however, they all

- articulated a clear set of policy priorities;
- described a track-record of successfully sponsoring or implementing policy changes; and
- demonstrated commitment to improving community environments and/or the institutions that shape eating and activity behaviors (or other aspects of community health).

Of these 152 groups, 82 (54%) made explicit mention of their focus on improving equity or reducing disparities for low-income people and people of color or other vulnerable populations (e.g., elderly or disabled).

### OVERVIEW OF “POISED” GROUPS

Appendix D, Table 2 lists 114 groups that were defined as “poised” to engage more deeply in policy and environmental change. *“Poised” groups tended to be geared toward (and enthusiastic about) policy formulation at the local, state, or federal levels. Organizations and coalitions in this category represent important collaborative partnerships in their geographical and topical areas of involvement. Follow-up research with “poised” groups might reveal progress over time toward advancing their work in policy.*

“Poised” groups varied with respect to their key issues, but generally shared the following characteristics:

- Initiated some environmental change or participated in policy advocacy, but not necessarily in a leadership role
- Lacked the strong track record of past policy successes that was the hallmark of “policy” groups
- Stated interest in utilizing policy and advocacy strategies to improve health
- Indicated that policy or environmental change work was the “next frontier” in their efforts
- Formed committees, action plans, or strategic plans indicating policy priorities or key environmental change issues they intended to work on

Fifty-eight “poised” groups (51%) made explicit mention of their focus on improving equity or reducing disparities for low-income people and people of color or other vulnerable populations (e.g., elderly or disabled).

### OVERVIEW OF GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS HAVING A PRIMARY FOCUS ON EDUCATION OR PROGRAM DELIVERY

Appendix D, Table 3 lists the 46 groups that were defined as having a primary focus on education, individual skill-building, or program delivery. Education/programmatic groups tended to make important contributions to raising awareness or improving access to services in the communities they serve. These groups did not have environmental change, policy advocacy, or social norms change as part of their agenda. In general, such groups were not interested in engaging in

**TABLE 1. CHARACTERIZATION OF INTERVIEWED ORGANIZATIONS**

<b>Characterization</b>	<b>Defining Elements</b>	<b># of Groups</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Engages in policy, environmental, or organizational change</li> <li>■ Articulates policy priorities (e.g., a policy platform)</li> <li>■ Possesses a track record with policy change (e.g., sponsored or implemented a successful policy)</li> <li>■ Demonstrates changes to the built environment (e.g., work to bring a walking path to the community)</li> <li>■ Transforms practices of institutions through organizational policy aimed at prevention (organizational change should be sustainable and systematic)</li> </ul>	152	49%
Poised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Is aware of a need to engage in policy and environmental change, but not fully focused on those strategies</li> <li>■ Interested in utilizing policy and advocacy strategies to improve health opportunities</li> <li>■ Views policy or environmental change as a “next frontier” in their work</li> <li>■ Has piloted on a small scale environmental, policy or organizational change and exploring ways to bring it to scale</li> </ul>	114	37%
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Engages in education-alone or individually oriented approaches</li> <li>■ Lacks evidence to demonstrate environmental change/policy strategies being implemented</li> <li>■ Mostly engages in programs, service delivery</li> <li>■ Measures of success are individuals served, number of program participants, etc.</li> </ul>	46	15%
Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Works in (or with) low-income communities or color</li> <li>■ Identifies strongly with improving equity, eliminating disparities, civil rights, social justice, etc.</li> <li>■ Demonstrates capacity to work effectively in communities of color</li> <li>■ Explicitly communicates an emphasis on addressing the health or social issues of one or more racial/ethnic “minority group”</li> </ul>	164	52%

**NOTE:** Percentages of Policy, Poised, and Education do not always equal 100 due to rounding and because groups characterized as having an equity focus were also characterized as policy, poised or education.



environmental/policy change work, did not see a role for their organization in environmental/policy change, or felt policy advocacy and environmental change were not “appropriate” strategies for their organization.

Twenty-four education/programmatic groups (52%) indicated a focus on improving equity or reducing disparities for low-income people and people of color or other vulnerable populations (e.g., elderly or disabled).

*The Snapshot* focuses on policy and environmental change organizations. To learn more about education/program groups, view the project database. Further research would help clarify capacity-building opportunities for education/program focused groups.

## Issues and opportunities for building a national movement to prevent childhood obesity

**T**he following section includes observations made by interviewers during hundreds of interviews with organizational representatives. Our basic product for The Snapshot was to identify and categorize advocacy efforts across the country, so we limited the set of observations below to recurring themes that we thought would be most valuable to share as the Foundation advances its national initiative.

### OVERARCHING OBSERVATIONS

The findings delineated below represent observations drawn from brief interviews with representatives from the 312 organizations and coalitions working to improve community well-being.

**A**lthough many struggled to make the connection, some groups were successful in making nutrition and physical activity policy priorities and key issues relevant in low-income communities and communities of color.

While we found that groups working on environmental justice, housing rights, or immigrant rights seemed, as a general rule, to be deeply rooted in, and connected to, communities of color, we also found a large reservoir of groups working on nutrition policy and changing the built environment to improve walking and biking that did not know how to bring their issues to the “front burner” with low-income residents. Despite sincere efforts, many organizations working to influence eating and activity policies did not have a tight connection to people of color. One interviewee said of his bicycle/pedestrian advocacy work: “How do you go in and talk about physical activity and nutrition when people are struggling to work?” Many groups expressed concern, frustration, or desire to

make their issues more relevant in low-income communities and communities of color. The 11 organizational snapshots developed for this project illustrate specific strategies groups use to increase the relevance of nutrition and physical activity in low-income communities and communities of color.

**M**ost environmental justice (EJ) groups possessed a strong track record for mobilizing communities of color to engage in policy, litigation, and environmental change.

We found EJ groups—particularly those clustered in California, New York, and Michigan—that expressed a high level of comfort and skill with their work in low-income communities and communities of color. These groups tended to emphasize community organizing around specific EJ issues. The issues were not always site specific (e.g., a specific toxic dump) but were often broader, city-wide issues such as contaminated brownfields or lead exposure. EJ groups seemed facile with policy advocacy and litigation strategies. EJ groups as a whole bought in to the notion of environmental change and tended not to grapple with the “individual responsibility” paradigm that nutrition and activity groups seemed to struggle with when they commented that nutrition and activity were very “personal issues.” When EJ groups do educate community members, they are generally educating them on how to change their environments, advocate for change, or participate in the litigation process. We heard interest and enthusiasm among many, but not all, of these groups for taking on issues related to childhood obesity prevention.

**A** small proportion of groups working to influence policies related to health care services and financing emphasized their commitment to eliminating health disparities; however, these groups were not engaged in changing social norms or physical environments.

About 10% of policy-oriented interviewees were engaged in policy advocacy that was not focused on environmental change but rather aimed at improving health programs and services (e.g., increasing reimbursement for Medicaid or enrollment in WIC). Most of these groups expressed an explicit focus on meeting the needs of low-income children and families and eliminating health disparities. When asked about their interest or enthusiasm for policy advocacy aimed at changing environments, their responses were varied. Some groups felt it was not within their purview and that the demand for services was too great to focus on prevention issues, while other groups did express interest.

**I**n southern states like Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi, it was difficult to identify advocacy groups outside of the major population centers (e.g., Atlanta, New Orleans) and when groups did exist, they were often programs of academic institutions or public health departments rather than stand-alone organizations.

Despite targeted efforts to identify advocacy groups in southern states, interviewers found it difficult to do so. Though we did interview 51 groups in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, we found it more challenging to make these connections than in some other states. As noted above in the challenges and limitations section, groups in the southern states were more difficult to identify at first and then harder to get in touch with. We found a high proportion of groups with non-working phone numbers or that were non-responsive. When we did identify groups, they were often affiliated with universities or local public health departments. These factors raised questions for interviewers about the capacity and resources for sustaining advocacy efforts in the South. CDC funded state-based programs from the Division of Nutrition and Physical Activity to Prevent Obesity and Other

Chronic Diseases represented the main nutrition and physical activity work in some states. Although these programs do not engage in policy and environmental change work as a general rule, they seemed to raise the visibility of obesity prevention efforts in some states. We noted that Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana lacked these state-based programs. Foundation resources such as RWJ funding provided groups in some southern states (Tennessee and Kentucky, for example) with their primary (and perhaps only) resources to embark on policy and environmental change efforts.

**G**roups with policy successes described putting a lot of energy into passing policies and acknowledged that although policy implementation and oversight are important elements of success, they did not always have sufficient resources or capacity to take on the role of watch dog.

While there were many policy-oriented groups who were able to mobilize effectively to advance policy priorities such as Complete Streets, healthier food in schools, or limited exposure to secondhand smoke, policy-oriented organizations tended to describe challenges associated with ensuring that policies were adequately implemented. When groups were relatively well-staffed and well-funded, they seemed to be better positioned to take on oversight and ensure policy implementation. When groups were smaller, with just one or two staff working to promote policy, they expressed having a hard time with overseeing policy implementation. Groups that described their work as entailing extensive community engagement, an active membership base, or community ownership seemed more likely to describe explicit and successful work to get policies implemented. Groups with a longer track record in the policy arena—for example seven or more years working on a set of policy issues—were highly likely to address implementation and oversight issues at the outset, (i.e., during policy development). For example, such groups might negotiate for development of a policy council or resident-based commission.

**E**ven among organizations funded to work on environmental and policy change, we found

### groups describing small-scale projects rather than broader community-wide change.

Many “poised” groups articulated a clear understanding of the value of policy and environmental change but when they described the actual content of their work, we found many small-scale school, workplace, or community projects rather than efforts to work toward district- or community-wide change. For example, we spoke to many Steps to a Healthier US grantees and others who were working on a single school wellness policy. It was not always clear whether groups were uncomfortable working on broader change or if they lacked the capacity to work across schools or districts.

### Groups bemoaned the challenges associated with staffing issues like staff turnover, staff retention, staff capacity-building, and small staff size.

Both policy and “poised” groups indicated a desire for staff capacity-building to strengthen and sustain initiatives. Issues like having a small staff, staff turnover, and few paid staff presented challenges to many groups. Policy groups often noted that despite having small staff, they were able to achieve major policy victories because a large part of their work was community organizing or building the capacity of their members to advocate for change.

### Most policy and “poised” groups who described their engagement in policy advocacy at the state or local level also described some level of involvement on major federal legislation affecting their key issues.

Groups working mostly at a state and local level do get involved in federal legislation on occasion. There appeared to be a short list of major federal initiatives that galvanized numerous local advocacy organizations. When speaking to local or statewide bike and pedestrian advocacy groups, we found groups not only working at the local or state level, but also engaging in some form of advocacy on major federal legislation like transportation reauthorization. These groups described affiliations with national groups such as Smartgrowth America or the Thunderhead Alliance as relevant to

their national policy advocacy. For food and nutrition groups working at the state or local level, the Farm Bill drew their advocacy efforts and attention. Groups described the importance of working on these major federal bills to affect the distribution of resources for the issues that they were working on locally.

## OBSERVATIONS BY US HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICE REGIONS

In addition to interviewing individual groups and observing trends across groups, we also attempted to draw out some observations within specific geographic regions. While there are many distinctions and variations within and across groups, we summarized some preliminary impressions around geographic clusters, according to the ten US Health and Human Service Agency Regions. These geographical clusters provide a potentially useful way to examine trends across several proximate states at once. Our hope is that these observations might prove valuable in further conceptualizing how to seed or catalyze a national movement to prevent childhood obesity, particularly as the Foundation explores how the issue might be framed to engage stakeholders and advocates in each of the regions. *Table 2: Overview of Regions*, on pages 10 and 11, provides a snapshot of each region.

## OBSERVATIONS ABOUT MULTI-SITE INITIATIVES

This section highlights observations from our interviews with groups participating in government or foundation funded multi-site initiatives, with particular attention to national efforts that emphasize(d) environmental change and policy advocacy.

Foundation and government initiatives play an important role in supporting local work. The following represents a partial list of the major, multi-site initiatives that we encountered while interviewing:

- Steps to a Healthier US Department of Health and Human Services
- REACH 2010, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- Pioneering Healthy Communities, YMCA

**TABLE 2. OVERVIEW OF REGIONS**

**REGION 1:** CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED:** 21

**POLICY:** 9 (43%)

**POISED:** 10 (48%)

**EDUCATION:** 2 (10%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Heavier emphasis on physical activity than nutrition. More groups working on smart growth and community design than changing food environments
- Statewide and regional (rather than local) work very common, probably because region is comprised of small states.
- Some cutting-edge nutrition policy in the region
- capacity-building could help to strengthen equity focus across region

**REGION 2:** NJ, NY, PR, VI

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED:** 20

**POLICY:** 11 (55%)

**POISED:** 7 (35%)

**EDUCATION:** 2 (10%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Most groups contacted in New York, clearly a hub of activism
- Equity focus strong
- Environmental Justice work concentrated and sophisticated in New York
- No groups contacted in Puerto Rico or Virgin Islands

**REGION 3:** DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED:** 35

**POLICY:** 17 (49%)

**POISED:** 10 (29%)

**EDUCATION:** 8 (23%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Greater emphasis on nutrition than physical activity across the region
- Equity focus evident among many groups
- Unlike most pedestrian advocacy groups, groups in this region working on pedestrian issues were focused more heavily on education rather than environmental or policy change
- Many poised groups needing to build capacity around sustaining environmental and policy change

**REGION 4:** AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED:** 51

**POLICY:** 25 (49%)

**POISED:** 19 (37%)

**EDUCATION:** 7 (14%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Difficulty getting in touch with groups
- Equity focus apparent among many groups
- Lack of resources and limited staff capacity a common concern
- Georgia, particularly Atlanta, clearly a hub of activism

**REGION 5:** IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED:** 37

**POLICY:** 13 (35%)

**POISED:** 18 (49%)

**EDUCATION:** 6 (16%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Hard to detect equity focus in this region, overall, but Detroit and Chicago did have efforts underway
- Activism among groups weighted more toward physical activity than nutrition, overall
- Illinois, particularly, Chicago and Michigan represent hubs of activism with innovative efforts to improve physical activity environments

**NOTE:** Percentages of Policy, Poised, and Education do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

**TABLE 2. OVERVIEW OF REGIONS, continued**

**REGION 6: AR, LA, NM, OK, TX**

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED: 23**

**POLICY:** 7 (30%)      **POISED:** 12 (52%)      **EDUCATION:** 4 (17%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Hard to reach groups—many leads did not pan out
- Equity focus among advocacy groups varied greatly by state with lots of attention to equity in New Mexico and Louisiana
- Many interviewed groups housed in (or strongly affiliated with universities or public health departments)—as a region difficult to locate community-based advocacy groups
- Groups commonly identified limited number of staff as a barrier to engaging in policy and environmental change

**REGION 7: IA, KS, MO, NE**

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED: 15**

**POLICY:** 4 (27%)      **POISED:** 7 (47%)      **EDUCATION:** 4 (27%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Most groups poised to engage more fully in policy, environmental and social norms change
- capacity-building could support increased awareness of social and environmental factors that contribute to health disparities
- Technical support could also provide groups with more information on proven and promising approaches to improving healthy eating and activity environments
- RWJ has *Active Living and Healthy Eating by Design* sites in the region which are both poised for action

**REGION 8: CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY**

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED: 20**

**POLICY:** 11 (46%)      **POISED:** 8 (33%)      **EDUCATION:** 5 (21%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- More physical activity, smartgrowth, environmental concerns than most regions—strong land conservation ethic
- Groups that did have an equity focus tended to work with Latinos or tribal groups
- Lots of opportunity build capacity of groups to integrate health disparities elimination into current work

**REGION 9: AZ, CA, HI, NV, Guam, American Samoa, CNMI**

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED: 56**

**POLICY:** 33 (59%)      **POISED:** 18 (32%)      **EDUCATION:** 5 (9%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- Geographically, a huge region, so lots of variation in capacity, approaches and issues
- Surprised by groups in Hawaii with demonstrated commitment to environmental and policy change
- For many policy issues, groups in California at the vanguard, still, lots of opportunities to strengthen capacity to engage in policy, environmental and social norms change, particularly in low-income, rural and African American communities

**REGION 10: AK, ID, OR, WA**

**GROUPS INTERVIEWED: 30**

**POLICY:** 22 (72%)      **POISED:** 5 (17%)      **EDUCATION:** 3 (10%)

**OVERALL IMPRESSIONS FROM INTERVIEWS:**

- As a whole, regional emphasis on equity was low; however individual groups do address disparities
- Strong land conservation/preservation focus, resulting in potential alignment with physical activity promotion
- Lots of groups using policy as a mechanism for improving activity environments, but less emphasis on changing policies to improve healthy eating opportunities
- capacity-building might support greater awareness of health disparities elimination among African Americans
- Technical support might also help build awareness of proven and promising practices for changing policies and environments to improve healthy food access

- Diversifying Leadership for Sustainable Food Systems, Noyse Foundation
- Healthy Eating by Design, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Active Living by Design, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Healthy Eating Active Communities, The California Endowment
- Healthy Eating Active Living, Kaiser Permanente
- The Food and Fitness Initiative, WK Kellogg Foundation

## MAJOR OBSERVATIONS ABOUT GROUPS ENGAGED IN MULTI-SITE FUNDING INITIATIVES

### Grantee efforts reflect the priorities of the initiative

Initiatives that are explicit about policy and environmental change have a better chance of advancing broad-scale change. Similarly, initiatives that make explicit mention of diversity or eliminating health disparities attract (or bring to the surface) groups who are focused on deepening their approaches in racial or ethnic minority communities. Naturally, not all groups within each funded initiative may reach the full potential or intention of the funding, but it was common to hear groups from similar initiatives describe their target populations, projects, or mandates in similar ways that aligned with the intention of the funding stream.

### Initiatives provide needed support for policy and environmental change—either as a catalyst for new efforts or to make changes that would sustain behavior and health improvements after grants end

According to most policy-oriented groups, funding for policy, environmental, and social norms change is a scarce commodity. Not surprisingly, groups described the resources dedicated toward systemic change as playing a vital role in advancing local policy advocacy work.

### Government and Foundation initiatives raise visibility of local efforts

Local groups articulated a benefit from exposure

that foundations and governments provided through communications and media. Communications and media strategies (e.g., press releases, web-sites, newsletters or annual reports) raised the visibility of local groups among elected officials, advocates, decision-makers, and other key stakeholders, in many cases paving the way for collaboration.

### Multi-site initiatives can create a peer-to-peer network

Grantees of multi-site initiatives seem to become a cohort and can provide each other with valuable information and strategies for achieving outcomes and overcoming obstacles; however, it takes time (in some cases 9–12 months or more) for grantees to “gel” and build relationships with one another so that they have a clear understanding of what other groups are doing and can develop a shared language for addressing similar challenges. Through in-person meetings, conference calls, or web-based meetings, initiatives could build in quality time for grantees to share what they are doing and where they are encountering roadblocks and to discuss ways to overcome obstacles.

### Initiatives often support or promote collaboration

Through major funding initiatives, grantees often receive increased visibility and technical and peer support (as noted above). In addition, some grants require a memorandum of understanding or specific partners (e.g., school districts) to be eligible for funding. While such requirements can sometimes create barriers to groups, they can also raise the expectation and increase the investment of project partners. Interviewees described mixed reactions, with some indicating that such requirements forged fruitful new partnerships and others suggesting that they forced them for the sake of the grant.

## Building on the Snapshot

The implications and next steps lay out some possible areas for further research and offer ideas about ways to build on the data and research that has been captured in *The Snapshot*.

The following implications are drawn primarily from the general observations provided in the Observation section above:

- Increasing the visibility of nutrition and physical activity policy change efforts that are working effectively in (and with) low-income residents and communities of color and sharing successful models could help expand the breadth and depth of obesity prevention in low-income communities and communities of color.
- Providing training and support could help build interest and capacity (particularly content knowledge) to facilitate involvement of local groups, such as environmental justice groups or health care service delivery and financing advocates, that are deeply invested in communities of color and low-income communities in childhood obesity prevention efforts.
- Conducting additional investigation and follow-up would help to clarify what steps, if any, would help engage groups working to influence alcohol and tobacco policy, environmental health policy, or health care service delivery and financing in broader efforts to change physical environments and social norms.
- Engaging in follow-up analysis and additional outreach in southern states might be warranted to help explain some of the factors that present particular challenges to catalyzing and sustaining advocacy efforts to address nutrition and physical activity disparities in southern states and to better understand what is needed to overcome these challenges.
- Systematically examining CDC funded state-based nutrition and physical activity programs could provide some clues about the role of state funded programs in raising the visibility and capacity for obesity prevention efforts in selected states.
- Understanding the factors (such as staffing and resources) that make some organizations more successful at ensuring policy implementation and oversight could help strengthen policy implementation efforts so that groups can go beyond the policy adoption process to achieve significant changes in community practices and norms.
- Honing in on the policy advocacy skills and content areas that advocacy groups need to help them focus on institutionalizing population-wide improvements through legislative channels or community-wide change could help groups become more comfortable with policy development and achieve broader impact.
- Identifying barriers to staff retention and development would help groups overcome staffing limitations. This would especially help “poised” groups to take on significant leadership in policy change efforts and work to sustain and nurture their efforts.
- Clarifying what factors draw in local and state advocates from diverse issues to advocate for federal legislation such as the Farm Bill and the Federal Transportation Reauthorization might be of value to building a national movement—such groups represent potential allies and advocates for federal legislation.



## POTENTIAL NEXT STEPS

The following represent some ideas for further use of the information collected in *The Snapshot*:

1. Combine the Mapping Database information with Urban Institute maps to create an additional layer that shows where advocacy groups exist in relation to geographic areas with high concentrations of predictive risk factors for obesity.
2. Post the Mapping Database Map (or modified version) on a public website for use by advocates. The majority of our mapping interviewees said that they would be most interested in using a map to connect with other advocacy organizations and learn more about “who else is out there.”
3. Follow-up with a subset of groups to better understand their approaches, capacity-building needs, existing networks, and progress over time, especially with groups that were identified as “poised.”
4. Conduct focus groups with Environmental Justice and Alcohol and Tobacco policy groups to better understand potential synergies and opportunities to contribute to a movement to prevent childhood obesity.
5. Finalize and prepare for public dissemination the organizational profiles to provide advocates and practitioners with concrete examples of innovative and effective approaches to improving community health and well-being.

## APPENDIX A: KEY INFORMANT ORGANIZATIONS

Action for Healthy Kids  
Active Living by Design  
Afterschool Alliance  
Allina Hospitals & Clinics  
American Public Health Association (APHA)  
Asian Pacific Partners for Empowerment, Advocacy, and Leadership (APPEAL)  
Association of State and Territorial Health Association (ASTHO)  
Boys & Girls Clubs of America  
California Center for Public Health Advocacy  
California Park & Recreation Society  
California Project LEAN  
Center for Food and Justice  
Center for Science in the Public Interest  
Center for Weight and Health  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Community Alliance with Family Farmers  
Community Food Security Coalition  
Complete Streets Coalition  
Consortium to Lower Obesity in Chicago Children (CLOCC)  
Contra Costa County Child Care Council  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Ford Research and Action Center  
Grantmakers In Health  
Head Start  
Health and Environmental Funders Network  
Health Care Without Harm  
Healthy Eating Active Living  
HHS Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion  
Institute for Community Resource Development  
International City/County Management Association  
Kaiser Permanente  
Kansas Health Foundation  
Leadership for Healthy Communities  
Michigan State University  
Mount Sinai Health Care Foundation  
National Association for Sport and Physical Activity  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)  
National Association of Chronic Disease Directors  
National Association of County and City Health Officials  
National Center for Bicycling and Walking  
National Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity  
National Conference of State Legislatures  
National Council of La Raza  
National Governors Association  
National Park Service- Rivers and Trails  
National Recreation and Park Association  
National Resources Defense Council  
National Safe Routes to School Clearinghouse  
National Urban League  
National WIC Association  
North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services  
Division of Public Health  
Northeast-Midwest Institute  
Northwest Health Foundation  
Noyes Foundation  
Partnership for Prevention  
PolicyLink  
Project for Public Spaces  
Public Health Law and Policy Program  
Pyramid Communications/Active Living Network  
Rails to Trails Conservancy  
Roots of Change  
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District  
Safe Routes to School National Partnership  
San Diego State University - Active Living Research  
School Nutrition Association  
Shaping America's Health  
Shaping America's Youth  
Smart Growth America  
SPARK  
Team up for Youth  
The Food Trust  
The Praxis Project  
Trust for Public Land  
United Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Association  
YMCA of the USA

## APPENDIX B: MAPPING CODEBOOK

The codebook is a reference for conducting queries of the Mapping Database, which was provided to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Obesity Prevention Team on a CD accompanying this report.

**TABLE 1. CONTACT INFORMATION**

Field Name	Entry Type	Options	Description
Organization	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Organization name
Coalition	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Major coalition(s) that the organization staffs
First name	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Interviewee’s first name
Last name	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Interviewee’s last name
Job title	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Interviewee’s job title
Other contacts at this organization	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Other contacts at the organization or coalition for an additional interview or follow-up
Address 1	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Organization or coalition’s street address
Address 2	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Address continued
City	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Address continued, city
State	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Address continued, state
Zip	Free-text	Open-ended, numeric	Address continued, zip
Phone	Free-text	Open-ended, numeric	Phone number may be the organization’s general number or the interviewee’s direct line
Email	Free-text	Open-ended, alpha numeric	E-mail may be the organization’s general e-mail or the interviewee’s e-mail
Website	Textbox	Open-ended, alpha numeric	Organization or coalition’s website address
Key informant?	Checkbox	Yes; No	Indicated whether or not interview was a key informant providing additional mapping contacts

## APPENDIX B: MAPPING CODEBOOK

TABLE 2. INTERVIEW INFORMATION

Field	Entry Type	Options	Description
Who	Checkbox	CC; JA; JGS; JS; SC; SD; LM; LS; MA; RB; VL	<p>Initials of Prevention Institute staff that conducted mapping interviews.</p> <p>CC: Carol Chao                      JA: Jesse Appelman            JGS: Juliette Sims                JS: Janani Srikantharajah            SC: Sana Chehimi                SD: Sam Davidson            LM: Leslie Mikkelsen            LS: Linda Shak            RB: Rhianna Babka                VL: Virginia Lee</p>
Communication Log	Textbox		Documentation of attempts to interview, modes of communication, and/or interview completion. This log also tracks the date records were updated.
Mapping interview completed?	Checkbox	Yes; No; Non-responsive; Defunct; No, but we have a good idea of group; KI	<p>All completed mapping interviews have the “yes” checkbox marked. This field guarantees a found set of completed interviews.</p> <p>This field also identifies other common reasons an organization or coalition were not interviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Non-responsive</b> (This contact was called FOUR times and have never returned any phone calls)</li> <li>■ <b>Defunct</b> (Phone number does not work, the organization is not on the internet, and/or the organization has closed)</li> <li>■ <b>No, but we have a good idea of group</b> (Groups we are familiar with and do not need to call)</li> </ul> <p><b>KI</b> identifies the contact in this record as a key informant. Key informants are not meant to be interviewed but rather to provide other groups to interview.</p>
Available for call back?	Button	Yes; No	Interviewee identified during the interview that we can contact them again if necessary.
Contact source	Textbox		Identifies who referred the organization or coalition

## APPENDIX B: MAPPING CODEBOOK

TABLE 3. MAPPING CHARACTERIZATION

Field	Entry Type	Options	Description
Policy Jurisdiction	Button	Local; state; federal; organizational practice; N/A	<p>This field identifies the level of governmental policy the organization predominantly works to influence, e.g., if the group works on municipal policy, then their policy jurisdiction is ‘local.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Local</b>—Target is city, county, or regional policy change.</li> <li>■ <b>State</b>—Target is statewide policy change.</li> <li>■ <b>Federal</b>—Target is federal policy change.</li> <li>■ <b>Organizational Practice</b>—Target is to change internal policies, practices, or procedures of one or more organizations.</li> <li>■ <b>N/A</b>—Group is not working on policy</li> </ul>
Policy orientation	Button	Policy; Poised; Education	<p>Based on Prevention Institute criteria, groups were rated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Policy</b>—Understand how to use policy to create change; engaged in policy work; and have documented successes</li> <li>■ <b>Poised</b>—Understand the importance of policy change; may not be working on policy; may not have the capacity to do policy; and/or have not traditionally focused on policy and are just beginning to think about it/take action.</li> <li>■ <b>Education</b>—Don’t see policy as their goal; engaged in education- alone or individually oriented approaches. Some academic groups fall in this category because even though their teachings/research indirectly affect policies, they are not advocating for specific policies themselves.</li> </ul>
Approach	Button	Environmental/ institutional; Services/ programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Environmental/Institutional</b>—Work focuses on changing the practices of communities and institutions to create healthier environments for people.</li> <li>■ <b>Services/Programs</b>—Work focuses on providing services or administering programs and even if they do policy, their policies focus on increasing access/quality of programs and services. May employ policy change strategies but policies focus on individuals or education not on environmental changes. Measures of success are individuals served, number of program participants, etc.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX B: MAPPING CODEBOOK

TABLE 3. MAPPING CHARACTERIZATION, continued

Field	Entry Type	Options	Description
Strong equity focus	Button	Yes	Groups with a strong equity focus have a set of issues they work on but have an overarching consideration of how the solutions they promote affect traditionally disenfranchised populations, including, people of color, the elderly, low-income, and people with disabilities.
Profile?	Button	Yes; One to watch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Profile</b>—Groups that were selected for emphasis on policy, environmental change and equity, representing unique work, and potential models for the field</li> <li>■ <b>One to Watch</b>—Groups that are just starting out, with an intent to engage in compelling policy/ environmental change work. Further exploration is needed.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX B: MAPPING CODEBOOK

TABLE 4. ORGANIZATION INFORMATION

Field	Entry Type	Options	Description
DHHS region and state	Checkbox and textbox for state abbreviation	Checkbox options: 1-10	The Department of Health and Human Services has divided the United States into 10 different regions. One region was selected based on the organization's state.  <a href="http://www.hhs.gov/about/regionmap.html">www.hhs.gov/about/regionmap.html</a>
Organization Description	Textbox		Description of organization, mission, vision, constituency, year of establishment, major regional, state or federal networks they are a part of.  The text in this field is often a combination of information from the organization's website and information from the interview.
Organization type	Button	Academic; Government; Non-profit; Other	Type of organization: Academic—e.g., university Government—e.g., city department Non-profit—e.g., 501c3 status Other—all others
ENACT environment	Checkbox	Childcare; afterschool; workplace; faith-based; school; community; hospitals/clinics; media	The <i>Strategic Alliance</i> developed ENACT (Environmental Nutrition and Activity Community Tool) to offer community members realistic ways to create positive change in their food and activity environments. The seven environments were carefully selected for their importance in individual and community health. This field reflects which environment the group intends to impact most.
Issue Area	Checkbox	N; PA; ATOD; EJ; Other; N/A	This field offers users a simple query for groups working in issue areas that are particularly important to RWJF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>N</b>—Nutrition</li> <li>■ <b>PA</b>—Physical Activity</li> <li>■ <b>ATOD</b>—Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs</li> <li>■ <b>EJ</b>—Environmental Justice</li> <li>■ <b>Other</b>—Not captured by the above options.</li> </ul>
Key issues	Textbox		Priority issue areas for the organization or coalition's work.

## APPENDIX B: MAPPING CODEBOOK

TABLE 4. ORGANIZATION INFORMATION, continued

Field	Entry Type	Options	Description
Mapping policy domains	Checkbox	For a full list of policy domains, see Appendix C. Definitions and Examples of Policy Domains	Policy domains reflect our clustering of specific policy priorities into a smaller number of domains or issues based on the specific policy priorities described during the interview. This field does not represent issue areas of interest—only areas where there is active policy work.
Specific policies	Textbox		Specific policies the organization is working on or advocating for. This field is paragraph form and may have more detail than the individually listed policy priorities.
Org Practice/ Policy Priority	Textbox		Succint descriptions of policies, ogranizational practices, or environmental change priorities.
Successes	Button	Yes; No	Identifies whether the group has had any policy successes.
Description of successes	Textbox		Describes any succeses to date.
Capacity needs	Button	Training; money; communication support; other	Any needs identified by interviewee.
Other capacity needs	Textbox		Any needs identified by interviewee.
Data entry	Button	Completed	Indicates that data entry has been completed and verified.



## APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS & EXAMPLES OF POLICY DOMAINS

Policy domains reflect our clustering of specific policy priorities into a smaller number of domains or issues based on what the organization or coalition articulated in the interview. For specific policies, please refer to the database entries for each specific agency. Below, you will find a brief definition of each policy domain and examples of specific policies that the domain would encompass.

Policy Domain	Definition	Examples
Advertising/Marketing	Paid, one-way communication through a medium in which the sponsor is identified and the message is controlled by the sponsor. Promotional efforts to sell an idea or product	Policies that fund social marketing campaigns;  Menu Labeling; Targeted marketing to children; Reducing exposure to unhealthy food/activity messages
Affordable Housing	Low-cost or subsidized housing for low-income people who cannot afford to rent or own in the open housing market.	Inclusionary housing policies; Redefinition of “affordable” in city plans
Agriculture/ Sustainable Food Systems	Encompasses farming and ranching. Systematic raising of plants and animals to produce goods for consumption that incorporates environmental health principles, does not deplete soils, and works to enhance the quality of life for farmers and society as a whole.	Community supported agriculture (CSA); Urban gardens/farms; Organic growing; the farm bill; Subsidies for new farmers
Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs	Policies related to the prevention, treatment, and management of substance abuse.	Funding for substance abuse programs; Tobacco-free work places; Smoke-free parks
Mass Transit	System to move larger numbers of people from one destination to another.	Light Rail, Subway, Commuter Rail, Public Transit, Bus
Bikeability/Walkability	Improving the ability for bicyclists and pedestrians to get around safely and easily	Rails to trails, complete streets, bike lanes, bike stations
Breastfeeding	Practice of mothers to use breastmilk to feed their infants for the first months of life	Baby-friendly hospitals; Lactation rooms
Energy Conservation/ Renewable Sources	Reducing the amount of consumption of energy sources that deplete the earth	Bicycling and walking as a form of transportation
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Regulating and reducing the amount of pollution and toxins that are deposited into the environment or where people live	Policies to curb pesticide spraying
Economic Development	Policies aimed toward increasing the capacity of individuals and communities to increase their ability to accumulate resources and wealth	Education reform, community revitalization

## APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS & EXAMPLES OF POLICY DOMAINS

Policy Domain	Defintion	Examples
Food Access/ Anti-Hunger	Getting food to those in need and making healthy food easily accessible to those who have do not have access	Food stamps; attracting grocery stores; Increasing participation in school meals; improving resources for food banks
Food Safety	Ensuring food is not toxic for consumers	Pesticides, toxins in food; mecury in fish
Healthcare	Policies that affect the healthcare environment	Access to healthcare, treatment, changes to hospitals and clinics
Healthy Food Purchasing	Organizations and institutions that make a commitment to purchasing healthy food	Resolutions to preferentially purchase healthy foods over unhealthy foods whenever possible. Healthy vending machine policies.
Land Use/ Planning/ Zoning	Decisions that affect the way land is used and buildings are built	trail creation, bike lanes, complete streets, building restrictions (liquor stores)
Parks/ Recreation	Policies that affect either the number of parks or the conditions of parks. Policies that increase opportunities for recreation	park creation, smoke-free parks, pesticide-free parks
School/Afterschool/ Childcare Physical Activity	The ability for children and school staff to be physically active in schools	District policies to promote physicla education; ordinances to promote afterschool physical activity
Open Space Preservation/ Conservation	Acquire or preserve land from development	Urban growth boundary, smart growth policies, fees for developers
School/ Afterschool/ Childcare Nutrition	The ability for children and school staff to eat healthily	cafeteria policy, fruit in schools, school wellness policy
Worksite Wellness	Policies that create a healthy workplace	Wellness benefits, healthy fruit box
Immigration Reform	Policies that seek to mitigate the negative repercussions of systems that affect immigrants	Policies that allow immigrants to obtain drivers licenses
NONE	No articulated policy priorities	Groups may be poised or education/program

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
WE ACT for Environmental Justice	New York	NY
Action for Healthy Kids	Skokie	IL
Healthy Silicon Valley-The Health Trust	San Jose	CA
Food Security Task Force	San Francisco	CA
Shape Up San Francisco Coalition	San Francisco	CA
Peninsula Bicycle & Pedestrian Coalition	San Mateo	CA
People Power	Santa Cruz	CA
Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates	Sacramento	CA
Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition	Santa Rosa	CA
Bronx Health Reach - Institute for Urban Family Health	New York	NY
REACH: Charleston and Georgetown Diabetes Coalitions	Charleston	SC
Arkansas Center for Health Improvement	Little Rock	AR
Partnership for Active Communities	Sacramento	CA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Advertising/Marketing Bikeability/Walkability Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthcare Healthy Food Purchasing Parks/Recreation School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Org'l Practice	Services/Programs	Yes
Open Space Preservation/Conservation Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Worksite Wellness Healthcare	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Physical Education Parks/Recreation Food Access/Anti-Hunger School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Advertising/Marketing Land Use/Planning/Zoning Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Healthcare Healthy Food Purchasing	Local; State; Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Montefiore School Health Program	Bronx	NY
Weighing In Collaborative	Kansas City	MO
Washington Area Bicyclist Association	Washington	DC
Advisory Council on Indian Health Care	Phoenix	AZ
Music City Moves! Partnership	Nashville	TN
Healthy Hawaii Initiative	Honolulu	HI
Healthy Kids Learn Better	Salem	OR
Transportation and Land Use Coalition	Oakland	CA
Steps to A Healthier PA-Fayette County	Uniontown	PA
My region.org	Orlando	FL
NY Overweight & Obesity Prevention Program	Albany	NY
New Orleans Food & Farm Network	New Orleans	LA
Colorado Tobacco Education and Prevention Alliance (CTEPA)	Denver	CO
Transit for Livable Communities - Minnesota	Saint Paul	MN

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Wellness Policies Land Use/Planning/Zoning Advertising/Marketing Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning Mass Transit	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Worksite Wellness School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Bikeability/Walkability Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Services/Programs	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Open Space Preservation/Conservation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Physical Education School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Steps to a Healthier Alabama, Southeast Region	Troy	AL
Steps to a Healthier Cherokee Nation	Tahlequah	OK
Louisville Metro Housing Authority, Healthy Eating by Design Louisville, KY	Louisville	KY
Illinois Coalition Against Tobacco	Chicago	IL
Community Farm Alliance	Louisville	KY
Colorado Walks	Denver	CO
Bicycle Colorado	Denver	CO
Chicagoland Bicycle Federation	Chicago	IL
Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Portland	OR
Transportation Alternatives	New York	NY
Walk Boston	Boston	MA
Walk Albuquerque	Albuquerque	NM
Vermont Bicycle and Pedestrian Coalition	Montpelier	VT
Intertribal Council of Arizona	Phoenix	AZ
Idaho Smart Growth	Boise	ID
Farm to Table	Santa Fe	NM
Alternative Energy Resources Organization	Helena	MT

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Healthy Food Purchasing Healthcare Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthy Food Purchasing Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare	Federal	Services/Programs	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability Mass Transit	State	Services/Programs	
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Land Use/Planning/Zoning Food Safety	State	Environmental/Institutional	



## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Community Action Partnership of Orange County	Garden Grove	CA
Fullerton Collaborative	Fullerton	CA
Latino Health Access	Santa Ana	CA
Georgia Coalition for Physical Activity and Nutrition (GPAN)	Stone Mountain	GA
Coalition for the Peoples' Agenda	Atlanta	GA
West Virginia Healthy Lifestyles Coalition	Charleston	WV
Policy Leadership for Active Youth	Atlanta	GA
New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene	New York	NY
Be Active North Carolina	Durham	NC
Indians for Wellness	Phoenix	AZ
Land for Tomorrow	Durham	NC
Iowa Bicycle Coalition	North Liberty	IA
Orton Family Foundation	Middlebury	VT

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation Economic Development Pollution/Toxin Reduction Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Parks/Recreation Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare Pollution/Toxin Reduction School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Healthy Food Purchasing Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing Open Space Preservation/Conservation	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Open Space Preservation/Conservation Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Economic Development Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice	Riverside	CA
ALBA — Agriculture And Land-Based Training Association	Salinas	CA
Marin County Bicycle Coalition	Fairfax	CA
Connecticut Recreation and Parks Association, Inc.	Rocky Hill	CT
Lifelong Communities Initiative	Atlanta	GA
PEDS Pedestrians Educating Drivers on Safety	Atlanta	GA
Bicycle Coalition of Maine	Augusta	ME
Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice	Detroit	MI
North Carolina Prevention Partners	Chapel Hill	NC
Muscle Powered	Carson City	NV
Kids First, Inc.	Providence	RI
Piedmont Environmental Council	Warrenton	VA
Vermont Smart Growth Collaborative	Burlington	VT
Children's Alliance	Seattle	WA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Parks/Recreation Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Mass Transit Healthcare	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Food Access/Anti-Hunger Land Use/Planning/Zoning Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Worksite Wellness Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Parks/Recreation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Physical Education Wellness Policies Healthy Food Purchasing Industry Regulation School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Energy Bikeability/Walkability Industry Regulation Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare Food Access/Anti-Hunger School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Mujeres de la Tierra	Los Angeles	CA
Consortium to Lower Obesity in Chicago's Children (CLOCC)	Chicago	IL
Quality Community Council	Charlottesville	VA
1000 friends of Oregon	Portland	OR
3Estrategies	Bend	OR
Deschutes Basin Land Trust	Bend	OR
Deschutes County Community Development Dept.	Bend	OR
Landwatch of Central Oregon	Bend	OR
Oregon Environmental Council	Portland	OR
Padres Unidos	Denver	CO
The Ella Baker Center for Human Rights	Oakland	CA
Upstream Public Health Advocacy Network	Portland	OR

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Open Space Preservation/Conservation Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation Pollution/Toxin Reduction Economic Development	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Bikeability/Walkability Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthcare Healthy Food Purchasing Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Affordable Housing Healthcare Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation Open Space Preservation/Conservation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability Parks/Recreation Open Space Preservation/Conservation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Open Space Preservation/Conservation	State Federal	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Immigration Reform	Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Economic Development	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Healthy Food Purchasing Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	State	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Healthy Environment Collaborative	Philadelphia	PA
Just Harvest	Pittsburg	PA
Pennsylvania Hunger Action Center	Harrisburg	PA
The Food Trust	Philadelphia	PA
Mountain Trails Foundation	Park City	UT
Center for Economic Security	Montague	MI
African-American Men Project (AAMP) -Hennepin County	Minneapolis	MN
Chinese Progressive Association	Boston	MA
Grass Roots Advocacy	Washington	DC
Environmental Indicators Project, Pacific Institute	Oakland	CA
Greenbelt Alliance	San Jose	CA
Livable City	San Francisco	CA
End Hunger CT	Hartford	CT
Jacksonville Community Council	Jacksonville	FL
Voices for Georgia's Children	Atlanta	GA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Parks/Recreation School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Economic Development	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing Economic Development	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Affordable Housing Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources Open Space Preservation/Conservation Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Mass Transit Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Industry Regulation Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Mass Transit Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	



## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Atlanta Regional Commission	Atlanta	GA
Hawaii Bicycle League	Honolulu	HI
PATH — Peoples Advocacy for Trails Hawaii	Kailua-Kona	HI
Iowans Fit for Life	Des Moines	IA
Teton Valley Trails and Pathways	Driggs	ID
Congress for New Urbanism	Chicago	IL
Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah	Salt Lake City	UT
Make the Road by Walking	Brooklyn	NY
Youth Ministries for Peace and Justice	Bronx	NY
Just Foods	New York	NY
Center for Health, Environment, and Justice - BE SAFE campaign	Castleton	NY
Advocates for Environmental Human Rights	New Orleans	LA
Environmental Health Watch - Cleveland Environmental Center	Cleveland	OH

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Alternative Transportation Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Healthcare Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Worksite Wellness	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Environmental Justice Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Pollution/Toxin Reduction Food Access/Anti-Hunger	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Industry Regulation Open Space Preservation/Conservation Environmental Justice	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger Open Space Preservation/Conservation Environmental Justice	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Environmental Justice Industry Regulation Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Energy Environmental Justice Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
ISLES	Trenton	NJ
Native American Rights Fund	Boulder	CO
Philadelphia Unemployment Project	Philadelphia	PA
Indiana Commission on the Social Status of Black Males	Indianapolis	IN
Oregon Action	Portland	OR
Southern Poverty Law Center	Montgomery	AL
North Carolina Justice Center	Raleigh	NC
National Center for Healthy Housing Formerly the National Center for Lead-Safe Housing	Columbia	MD
Northwest Federation of Community Organizations (NWFCO)	Seattle	WA
Envision Utah	Salt Lake City	UT
Feet First	Seattle	WA
Friends of Pathways	Jackson	WY
PACT — People Acting in Community Together	San Jose	CA
San Francisco Tobacco Free Coalition	San Francisco	CA
Greenfield Walking Group/Get Moving Kern	Bakersfield	CA
STEPS Coalition of King County	Seattle	WA

Policy Domains	Jurisdiction	Approach	Strong Equity Focus?
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Pollution/Toxin Reduction Economic Development Open Space Preservation/Conservation	Federal	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare Economic Development	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Economic Development	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Affordable Housing Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Immigration Reform	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Immigration Reform Worksite Wellness Economic Development Affordable Housing	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare Food Access/Anti-Hunger Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Economic Development Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Bikeability/Walkability School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare Bikeability/Walkability Affordable Housing School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Food Access/Anti-Hunger Parks/Recreation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Acting Food Policy Council of Seattle King County	Renton	WA
Seattle and King County Overweight Prevention Initiative and Washington State Nutrition and Physical Activity Policy Leadership Group	Seattle	WA
Federation of Southern Cooperatives	East Point	GA
Farm Workers Pesticide Project	Seattle	WA
Active Living Ramsey County	Maplewood	MN
San Francisco Bicycle Coalition	San Francisco	CA
Working Partnerships USA	San Jose	CA
Center for Neighborhood Technology	Chicago	IL
Central Iowa Tobacco Free Partnership	Des Moines	IA
Breathe Free Out	Portland	OR
Coalition to End Childhood Lead Poisoning	Baltimore	MD
Voices for Virginia's Children	Richmond	VA
Oregon Environmental Justice Action Group	Portland	OR
Miami Workers Center	Miami	FL
Council on Alcohol and Drugs: Georgia Underage Drinking Prevention Initiative	Atlanta	GA
Camden Children's Alliance & Resources	St. Mary's	GA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources Economic Development Food Access/Anti-Hunger Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Breastfeeding School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Parks/Recreation Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Federal	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Parks/Recreation Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare Affordable Housing Economic Development Land Use/Planning/Zoning Mass Transit	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Parks/Recreation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing Economic Development	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Healthcare	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 1. POLICY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	City	State
Drug Policy Alliance	Washington	DC
Partnership for a Healthy Mississippi	Ridgeland	MS
Peers Against Tobacco	Napoleonville	LA
Kentuckians for the Commonwealth	London	KY
Get Real	Aurora	CO
Virginia Interfaith Center	Richmond	VA
The Bus Riders Union: at The Labor/Community Strategy Center	Los Angeles	CA
Public Citizens for Children and Youth (PCCY)	Philadelphia	PA
Piñeros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (english)	Woodburn	OR

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Federal	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources Economic Development Pollution/Toxin Reduction	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Mass Transit Pollution/Toxin Reduction Economic Development	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Economic Development Pollution/Toxin Reduction Food Safety Immigration Reform	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes



## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
Napa Bicycle Coalition	Napa	CA
Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition	Santa Barbara	CA
New Mexico Task Force to End Hunger	Santa Fe	NM
Shape Up Somerville Worksite Intervention Technician Physical Activity and Nutrition Program Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention Department of Human Services Oregon Health Services	Somerville	MA
REACH Boston Elders 2010 - Boston Public Health Commission	Boston	MA
Activate Omaha Kids	Omaha	NE
San Francisco Bay Trail	Oakland	CA
STEPS to a Healthier Minnesota	St. Paul	MN
Healthy Shasta	Redding	CA
Safety Network	San Francisco	CA
Walk/Bike Nashville	Nashville	TN
All Alaska Pediatric Partnership	Anchorage	AK
Steps to a Healthier San Antonio	San Antonio	TX
Steps PA Luzerne County	Wilkes-Barre	PA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Org'Practice	Services/Programs	
Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
None but group is currently engaged in strategic planning. Policy will be the highest priority.	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthy Food Purchasing Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Services/Programs	
None but group is engaged in policy in community safety/violence prevention – not reflected in policy domain options.	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local State	Services/Programs	
Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Worksite Wellness School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Services/Programs	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Worksite Wellness School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
Steps To a Healthier New Orleans	New Orleans	LA
Steps to a Healthier US Mesa County	Grand Junction	CO
Steps to a Healthier Colorado	Denver	CO
Arizona Steps	Phoenix	AZ
Hillsborough County Health Department Steps Program	Tampa	FL
NY State Steps	Albany	NY
Delaware Valley Smart Growth Alliance	Haddonfield	NJ
Steps Program, Tioga County PA	Wellsboro	PA
NY State Healthier Eating and Physical Activity Alliance	Chappaqua	NY
Steps Pueblo County, Colorado	Pueblo	CO
Steps Teller County, Colorado	Divide	CO
Steps Yuma County: University of Arizona— Yuma Cooperative Extension	Yuma	AZ

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Bikeability/Walkability Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthcare	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthy Food Purchasing Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Wellness Policies School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Breastfeeding Bikeability/Walkability School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Industry Regulation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Worksite Wellness Healthy Food Purchasing School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Physical Education School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Breastfeeding Industry Regulation Healthy Food Purchasing	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Wellness Policies Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
Tohono O’odham Community Food System	Sells	AZ
Steps to a Healthier Dekalb County, Georgia	Decatur	GA
Steps to a Healthier Anishinaabe, Michigan	Sault Ste. Marie	MI
Steps to a Healthier Cleveland, Ohio	Cleveland	OH
MarketUmbrella.org	New Orleans	LA
Campeños Sin Fronteras	Somerton	AZ
Illinois Health Education Consortium, Healthy Eating by Design, Chicago IL	Chicago	IL
Denver Alliance on Tobacco and Health	Denver	CO
The Alliance for Community Health	Washington	DC
ONDA - Oregon Natural Desert Association	Bend	OR
Taos County Community Economic Development Corporation	Taos	NM
Nuestras Raíces	Holyoke	MA
Oneida Community Integrated Food Systems	Oneida	WI
Mississippi River Trail	Fayetteville	AR

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Healthy Food Purchasing Healthcare Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Healthy Food Purchasing Bikeability/Walkability Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Worksite Wellness Land Use/Planning/Zoning Healthy Food Purchasing Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing Bikeability/Walkability	Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Open Space Preservation/Conservation	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Economic Development Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthy Food Purchasing Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
Atlanta Community Food Bank	Atlanta	GA
Greater Chicago Food Depository	Chicago	IL
The San Antonio Health Literacy Initiative	San Antonio	TX
South Dakota Bicycle Coalition	Brookings	SD
Healthy Weight Council at the New Mexico Department of Health	Albuquerque	NM
REACH Alabama - Univ. of Alabama School of Medicine	Birmingham	AL
Arkansas Hunger Coalition	Little Rock	AR
Starkville in Motion	Mississippi State	MS
Arizona Department of Health Services	Phoenix	AZ
GM-Free Campaign — Institute for Responsible Technology	Fairfield	IA
Communities of Opportunity	San Francisco	CA
Hartford Food System	Hartford	CT
Livable Communities Coalition	Atlanta	GA
Coalition for Living Well After 50	West Lafayette	IN
Indiana Institute on Disability and Community	Bloomington	IN
Deep South Center for Environmental Justice (DSCEJ)	New Orleans	LA
One Less Car - Maryland Campaign for Bicycling & Walking	Baltimore	MD
Detroit Urban Research Center	Ann Arbor	MI
Garden Resource Program Collaborative	Detroit	MI
Greening of Detroit	Detroit	MI

Policy Domains	Jurisdiction	Approach	Strong Equity Focus?
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Healthy Food Purchasing	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Healthcare	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
None but group is poised to start a coalition with policy goals.	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Safety Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	
Affordable Housing Healthcare	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Energy Conservation/Renewable Sources	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes



## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

**TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>
Michigan Community and School Gardens Coalition	Detroit	MI
Healthy Youth Partnership	St. Louis	MO
Kansas City - Chronic Disease Coalition	Kansas City	MO
Bike Walk Mississppi	Jackson	MS
NC Alliance for Health	Morrisville	NC
Activate Omaha	Omaha	NE
Ho-Chunk Community Development Corporation	Walthill	NE
Center for Home Care Policy and Research (AdvantAge Initiative)	New York	NY
BikeWalk Virginia	Williamsburg	VA
Vermont Forum on Sprawl (Grow Smart VT)	Burlington	VT
Indianapolis Commission on African American Males	Indianapolis	IN
GAHPERD, Inc.	Conyers	GA
Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development (OCCORD)	Garden Grove	CA

Policy Domains	Jurisdiction	Approach	Strong Equity Focus?
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Services/Programs	
Healthy Food Purchasing Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	State	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity Worksite Wellness	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Affordable Housing Bikeability/Walkability None – group has been engaged in policy in the past so they are poised but there is no active policy work at the time.	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local	Services/Programs	
Bikeability/Walkability Alternative Transportation Affordable Housing Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing Healthcare School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Parks/Recreation School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Open Space Preservation/Conservation	State	Services/Programs	
Bikeability/Walkability Economic Development Healthy Food Purchasing Land Use/Planning/Zoning Parks/Recreation Open Space Preservation/Conservation Worksite Wellness Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
Mississippi Association of Cooperatives	Jackson	MS
San Francisco ACORN	San Francisco	CA
Commute Options	Bend	OR
Human Dignity Coalition	Bend	OR
Bike-Walk Alliance of New Hampshire	Salem	NH
PUFFA —Philadelphia Urban Food and Fitness Alliance	Philadelphia	PA
Denver Urban Gardens	Denver	CO
Alliance of Communities Around the River	Los Angeles	CA
Bikestation	Long Beach	CA
Smart Growth Partnership	Ft. Lauderdale	FL
Neighborhood House of North Richmond	Richmond	CA
Montgomery Area Wellness Coalition	Montgomery	AL
Atlanta Regional Health Forum	Atlanta	GA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing Healthcare Parks/Recreation Immigration Reform Food Access/Anti-Hunger Mass Transit	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Parks/Recreation Land Use/Planning/Zoning Open Space Preservation/Conservation	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Services/Programs	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Food Access/Anti-Hunger Pollution/Toxin Reduction Food Safety	Org'l Practice	Services/Programs	Yes
Healthcare Worksite Wellness School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthy Food Purchasing Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability Open Space Preservation/Conservation Affordable Housing Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
East New York Farms	Brooklyn	NY
Community Against Pollution, Inc	Anniston	AL
Greensboro Housing Coalition	Greensboro	NC
The Point	Bronx	NY
Mothers on the Move	Bronx	NY
Black Health Coalition of Wisconsin	Milwaukee	WI
Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness	Washington	DC
New Hampshire Minority Health Coalition (REACH)	Manchester	NH
Community Coalition for Environmental Justice	Seattle	WA
PIA — Peninsula Interfaith Action	San Carlos	CA
NM Food and Agriculture Policy Council	Santa Fe	NM
Trailnet	St. Louis	MO
Goodhue County Public Health Service	Red Wing	MN
Healthy Communities Walking Program	Ypsilanti	MI
Maryland Healthy Eating and Active Lifestyle Coalition	Baltimore	MD

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Open Space Preservation/Conservation Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Affordable Housing Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Parks/Recreation Land Use/Planning/Zoning Environmental Justice Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Affordable Housing	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Healthcare	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Pollution/Toxin Reduction Affordable Housing	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Affordable Housing Healthcare	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Open Space Preservation/Conservation Land Use/Planning/Zoning	State	Environmental/Institutional	
Land Use/Planning/Zoning Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Worksite Wellness School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity	Local Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability Parks/Recreation Worksite Wellness Food Access/Anti-Hunger Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Services/Programs	
Worksite Wellness Parks/Recreation School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Healthcare	State	Environmental/Institutional	

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

TABLE 2. GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS “POISED” FOR POLICY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Organization	City	State
Pick Up the Pace, Saline!	Ypsilanti	MI
The Food Project, Boston	Dorchester	MA
Ypsilanti Health Coalition	Ypsilanti	MI
San Diego County Bicycle Coalition	San Diego	CA
Go Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill	NC
Muscogee Creek Nation Tobacco Program	Okmulgee	OK
Philadelphia Anti-Drug/Anti-Violence Network (PAAN)	Philadelphia	PA
Tobacco-Free Partnership of Alachua County	Gainesville	FL
Partners in Prevention of Substance Abuse Coalition (PIPSA)	Gainesville	FL
The Boston Collaborative for Food and Fitness	Dorchester	MA
The National LGBT Tobacco Control Network	Boston	MA
Colorado GLBT Community Center/ Smoke Free GLBT	Denver	CO
Tenants and Workers United	Alexandria	VA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
Bikeability/Walkability Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Agriculture/Sustainable Food Systems Food Access/Anti-Hunger Land Use/Planning/Zoning School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability Food Access/Anti-Hunger Parks/Recreation Worksite Wellness	Local Org'l Practice	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Mass Transit Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
School/Afterschool/Childcare Physical Activity School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	Federal	Services/Programs	Yes
Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Economic Development Healthcare	Local	Environmental/Institutional	Yes



## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

**TABLE 3.**  
**GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS HAVING A PRIMARY FOCUS OF EDUCATION OR PROGRAM DELIVERY**

Organization	City	State
Bike Bakersfield	Bakersfield	CA
Front Porch Alliance	Kansas City	MO
REACH 2010 Latino Health	Lawrence	MA
Washington Smart Growth Alliance (main)	Bethesda	MD
America on the Move in Colorado (University of Colorado at Denver Health Sciences Center, Center for Human Nutrition)	Denver	CO
Steps Weld County, Colorado	Greeley	CO
Steps, Santa Cruz County	Nogales	AZ
Make the Move Red Wing	Red Wing	MN
Southeastern Minnesota Area Agency on Aging	Rochester	MN
Steps to a Healthier Florida, Pinellas County	St. Petersburg	FL
PANA - Pennsylvania Advocates for Nutrition and Activity	Harrisburg	PA
Friends of the Center for Human Nutrition, Healthy Eating by Design Denver	Denver	CO
PedNet, Healthy Eating by Design Columbia, MO	Columbia	MO
Bear County Community Health Collaborative	San Antonio	TX
The Hawaii Foodbank	Honolulu	HI
Standing Rock Diabetes Program	Fort Yates	ND
D.C. Central Kitchen	Washington DC	DC
Sustainable Food Center	Austin	TX
Pioneering Healthy Communities - YMCA of Rapid City	Rapid City	ND
Kansas Nutrition Network	Wichita	KS
Minority Health Project, UNC Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill	NC
West Virginia Healthy Kids and Families Coalition	Charleston	WV
Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development	Atlanta	GA
Ma'at Youth Advocates for Healthy Diets Program	Richmond	CA

<b>Policy Domains</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Strong Equity Focus?</b>
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	State	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Org'l Practice	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	
None	State	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	State	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
None	State	Services/Programs	Yes
None	N/A	Services/Programs	Yes
None	State	Environmental/Institutional	
None	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes

## APPENDIX D: ORGANIZATIONS BY POLICY CHARACTERIZATION

**TABLE 3.**  
**GROUPS CHARACTERIZED AS HAVING A PRIMARY FOCUS OF EDUCATION OR PROGRAM DELIVERY**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>
Walk San Francisco	San Francisco	CA
Flipany	Fort Lauderdale	FL
Perils for Pedestrians	Bethesda	MD
REACH Detroit Partnership	Detroit	MI
Hands on Health South Carolina	Charleston	SC
Alliance for Community Choice in Transportation	Charlottesville	VA
Seattle & King County REACH 2010 Coalition	Seattle	WA
KANSAS CITY FOOD CIRCLE	Kansas City	MO
HACO (Healthy Active Central Oregon)	Bend	OR
Neighbor Impact	Redmond	OR
Community Planning Academy	Atlanta	GA
Community Action Coalition	Madison	WI
Family Health Council of Central Pennsylvania	Camp Hill	PA
Healthy Heroes	Chicago	IL
Louisiana Bucket Brigade	New Orleans	LA
People's Environmental Center	New Orleans	LA
White Earth Land Recovery Project	Callaway	MN
Coalition for the Homeless	Washington	DC
Local Motion	Burlington	VT
BBKH Coalition	New York	NY
Tobacco Free Partnership of Citrus County	Lecanto	FL
National Latino Council on Alcohol and Tobacco Prevention	New York	NY

Policy Domains	Jurisdiction	Approach	Strong Equity Focus?
None	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
None	Org'l Practice	Services/Programs	
None	N/A	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	State	Services/Programs	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Org'l Practice Local	Services/Programs	Yes
Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Environmental/Institutional	
Bikeability/Walkability	Local	Services/Programs	
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Org'l Practice Local	Environmental/Institutional	
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	N/A	Services/Programs	
Pollution/Toxin Reduction	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local State	Environmental/Institutional	Yes
School/Afterschool/Childcare Nutrition Food Access/Anti-Hunger	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Local	Services/Programs	Yes
None	Federal	Services/Programs	Yes
None		Services/Programs	

