

Residents Live in Communities with Health-Promoting Land Use, Transportation, and Community Development

OUTCOME FOUR

Acknowledgments

Prevention Institute developed this guide – Jeremy Cantor is the lead author, Leslie Mikkelsen is a contributing author, and Dalila Butler and Omar Sahak provided content and support. We would like to thank Rachel Davis from Prevention Institute for improving the section on violence and safety and insuring that it aligns with the guide for Outcome Five – *“Children and Their Families Are Safe from Violence in Their Homes and Neighborhoods;”* Robert Ogilvie and his colleagues at Public Health Law and Policy for multiple contributions and insights; the Healthy Eating Active Living Convergence Partnership, whose documents were instrumental in the development of this guide (in particular **Strategies for Enhancing the Built Environment to Support Healthy Eating and Active Living**); and George Flores and Marion Standish at The California Endowment for their guidance. Our gratitude extends as well to Julie Williamson and Robin Dean at the Partnership for the Public’s Health, who were responsible for the overall coordination and production process of this Resource Guide.

Table of Contents

I.	Background	1
II.	Brief Overview of Health-Promoting Land Use, Transportation, and Community Development	1
III.	Promising Strategies and Practices	4
	A. Walkable and Bikeable Neighborhoods	4
	B. Public Transit	8
	C. Parks, Recreation, Open Space	10
	D. Safety: Violence and Perceived Violence	13
	E. Healthful Food Environments	16
	F. Land Use Policy	23
	G. Current Political Opportunities	26
	H. Climate change	27
	I. Stimulus Funding	27
	J. Other Federal Funding Sources	28
	K. Conclusion	29
IV.	Measures of Progress	30
V.	Additional Resources	32
	Endnotes	35

Using This Guide: A Note to Building Healthy Communities Coalition Leaders

Purpose/Audience

Each of the Building Healthy Communities *Outcome Resource Guides* is intended to provide a deeper understanding of the background and context for each outcome, a sampling of promising practices and strategies that will contribute to achieving each outcome, and additional tools and resources that can help local leaders plan for improving the health of their communities. These guides were written specifically to assist local leaders and planners in the 14 communities participating in the Building Healthy Communities program of The California Endowment.

Strategies and Promising Practices

The strategies and practices described in each guide are intended to provide options and spark new ideas for local planners. These lists and examples do not represent all known strategies and policy directions in the field. Rather, they represent an overall direction that, based on the evidence at hand, show promise for contributing to a comprehensive approach to improving health in California communities.

Indicators of Success

These indicators are examples of ways to measure changes in this outcome. The appropriate indicator to use as a part of measuring progress, either as a part of an evaluation or a performance monitoring plan, will depend on the targeted changes and strategies that are selected either as part of a Place's work plan or part measuring a grantee's performance.

Contributing to the Knowledge Base

These guides constitute the beginning of a TCE library of resources that will grow over the next 10 years based on the experiences of BHC communities, as well as on emerging evidence for promising policies and practices in the field as a whole. Community residents, local leaders as well as researchers and scholars are invited to add to this foundation as new tools, strategies, experience and evidence emerge. Please contact TCE at www.calendow.org.

December 2009

HEALTHY LAND USE

Outcome Four: Residents Live in Communities with Health-Promoting Land Use, Transportation, and Community Development**I. Background**

Outcome Four, “Residents Live In Communities with Health-Promoting Land Use, Transportation, and Community Development,” is based on the conclusion that conditions in our physical surroundings (environment) where we live, work, play, learn, and shop; how we travel and transport goods; and even where our food comes from; all impact our health and well-being. For example, childhood obesity rates are higher in places that lack access to fresh produce and have no safe places to walk, play, and ride bikes. Conversely, school attendance may improve in some places if there was better public transportation. Unhealthy environments are usually the products of decision-making and policies that don’t reflect health as a priority, and are most often found in low-income communities and communities of color. These are the places with disproportionately greater health and social problems that trace to the risks and exposures of unhealthy environments. Work toward Outcome Four can benefit one or several of the “Big Results,” and has overlap or synergy with other Outcomes, such as school and neighborhood environments, and youth development. In particular, Outcome Four should be looked at in conjunction with Outcomes Five and Seven for a complementary discussion of comprehensive violence prevention strategy and physical environment issues (including air and water quality and goods transport). Although work to improve physical environments has long been a fundamental part of civic efforts to protect health (e.g., clean water, clean air, sanitation, etc.), the language, institutions, and methods of this arena are different and sometimes challenging to the newcomer. Still, this is where some of the newest and most exciting advancements toward “health in all policies” are happening, through civic hearings and decisions where youth, *promotoras*, community leaders, and other health advocates are giving voice to reshape the conditions in which we live, to make them healthier and more equitable.

II. Brief Overview of Health-Promoting Land Use, Transportation, and Community Development

For the purposes of this resource guide, land use, transportation, and community development are referred to collectively as “the built environment.” The built environment is broadly inclusive of manmade surroundings that include buildings, public facilities (including sidewalks, roadways, and parks), land use patterns, transportation systems, and design features.¹ Some of the greatest gains in health achieved over the last century were measures applied in the built environment such as sanitation, clean water, and vector control to protect against infectious disease. Research continues to document links between the built environment and a range of contemporary chronic disease outcomes and health-shaping exposures and behaviors. Recently, leading health care professional organizations have begun to publicly acknowledge the importance of the connection between the built environment and health – the American Academy of Pediatrics issued a policy brief outlining the importance of changing the physical environment for children’s health and the California Medical Association passed a resolution declaring support for achieving health objectives through land use and transportation policy.^{2,3} Policymakers at a national, state, and local level have been issuing legislation explicitly focused on the built environment and health including a national Healthy Places Act sponsored by then Senators Obama and Clinton and a California version of the bill sponsored by Assembly Members Leno and DeSaulnier.

HEALTHY LAND USE

Specific community factors – such as the availability of parks and walking trails, the presence of retail outlets with affordable high-quality produce and other healthy foods (and limited availability of unhealthy products such as alcohol), available and affordable public transit, well-maintained sidewalks, schools and housing that are constructed of high-quality materials and situated to encourage physical activity – appear to have a strong influence on the health status of community residents. In California, improving the built environment is an important component of a strategic approach to improve health and reduce health inequities – a way to avoid illness and injury *in the first place*.

There are a number of key opportunities for action: decisions and policies of government (local, state, and federal), businesses, and institutions have an important impact on shaping the built environment. For example, policies and practices related to transportation and land use, investments in commercial and residential developments, and the location of schools and worksites ultimately influence the distances people travel to work, the convenience of purchasing healthy foods, and the safety and attractiveness of neighborhoods for walking and accessing neighborhood services and parks. Many California localities have begun to think more carefully about implementing changes that employ built environment strategies to improve health.

There are a number of important principles that should be incorporated into all efforts to advance health-promoting built environments:

Equity

Good health is not experienced evenly across society – heart disease, cancer, diabetes, stroke, injury, violence, and other health outcomes occur in higher frequency, earlier, and with greater severity in certain communities, particularly among low-income people and communities of color. Differences in the built environment are a determining factor in shaping patterns of illness and injury. Differential land use policy is evident across a range of issues that affect health. For example, in California, alcohol advertising is significantly more prevalent in communities of color;⁴ residents of low-income communities and communities of color are much more likely to be exposed to harmful levels of airborne toxins and dust;⁵ and Latino, African-American, and Asian American/Pacific Islander youth are less likely than their White counterparts to enjoy access to parks and playgrounds and are exposed to disproportionately high volumes of traffic while walking to and from school.^{6,7}

Health inequity is related both to a legacy of overt discriminatory actions on the part of government and the larger society and to present-day practices and policies of public and private institutions. The result of these policies and practices is evident in the physical environments of communities. For example, residential segregation by race persists in California;⁸ low-income people of color are far more likely to live in high-poverty communities than low-income white people.⁹ Racially and economically segregated communities are more likely to have limited economic opportunities, a lack of healthy options for food and physical activity, increased presence of environmental hazards, substandard housing, lower performing schools, higher rates of crime and incarceration, and higher costs for the same goods and services than in higher-income communities (the so-called “poverty tax”).¹⁰

HEALTHY LAND USE

Segregation is not a random occurrence or the result of individual choice. Homeowners' associations and others have used restrictive covenants to explicitly restrict home ownership by non-white individuals (many of these covenants still exist on deeds). Banks, the Federal Housing Administration, and other lenders have employed "redlining" practices to restrict investment in minority businesses and neighborhoods; and the Federal Government's GI Bill has disproportionately supported home ownership for returning white soldiers.¹¹ This legacy is still manifest and results in concentrations of poverty that promote negative outcomes such as inferior services (including schools), political disenfranchisement, and the siting of hazardous industries.

It is critical that efforts to improve the built environment recognize and prioritize advancing health equity. Improvements to the built environment need to be approached in a manner that does not result in adverse effects on low-income populations and communities of color. The goal of enhancing quality of life for community residents must be carried out while avoiding gentrification that displaces long-time residents when more amenities lead to higher rents, mortgages, and property taxes.¹² PolicyLink's Equitable Development Toolkit is a helpful resource that describes policy tools and approaches that can be used to build health and wealth within a community by ensuring living wages, creating permanent affordability of quality housing, enhancing local businesses and employment through public contracts, and supporting local fresh foods and opportunities for physical activity. (See <http://policylink.info/EDTK/>)

Collaboration Across Sectors

In almost all jurisdictions, sectors are siloed without a mechanism to work collaboratively to provide a coherent, effective set of solutions. This is critical to address, because tackling complex problems such as safety and chronic illness and reducing health inequities cannot be achieved by any one organization or sector, let alone any single department or division within public health. Successful collaborative efforts include high-level leadership, a clear process and method for working together and establishing priorities, and explicit shared objectives. In Marin County, an intersectoral collaboration between public health and planning began as part of a coalition involved in the community needs assessment required of non-profit hospitals and has continued to take on additional challenges such as the addition of health language into the general plan revision. (See <http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/editor/chapter12.pdf>, pages 84-86).

Community Engagement

Community engagement is an essential component of any effort to improve the built environment and achieve health equity. Too often, community engagement is tacked on to initiatives in a superficial manner, whereas it should be built in from the beginning of any comprehensive effort. Community-based organizations, the faith community, local businesses, and community residents such as youth and grassroots activists all have a vital role to play in efforts to improve health. Their engagement, input, and leadership are critical from the outset in defining the problem, prioritizing strategies, and providing feedback on implementation. Their participation helps ensure that planning, programming, and policies align closely with community needs and supports accountability and sustainability. The most effective processes bring together community members with representatives from multiple public sectors. Two good examples of collaborative planning and

HEALTHY LAND USE

prioritization processes are the Community-Driven Eden Area Livability Initiative in Alameda County (http://preventioninstitute.org/documents/EALI_final_report_0309_000.pdf) and the Eastern Neighborhood Community Health Impact Assessment in San Francisco (http://www.sfphes.org/enchia/2007_09_05_ENCHIA_Final_Report.pdf).

III. Promising Strategies and Practices

There are a number of key characteristics of health-promoting built environments. Below is a discussion of these characteristics along with examples of successful efforts and some of the best resources for creating community change. For strategies related to improving the quality of housing, see Resource Guide Seven, **Neighborhood and School Environments Support Improved Health and Healthy Behaviors**.

A. Walkable and Bikeable Neighborhoods

Specific features in the built environment influence whether people choose to walk or bicycle for transportation, and these features can be effective tools for increasing daily physical activity, improving air quality, and reducing traffic-related injuries. Neighborhoods that have destinations that are well connected and in close proximity to each other, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly infrastructure, effective traffic-calming measures, and accessibility to public transit encourage and support walking and bicycling as forms of transportation and recreation.

People are more likely to walk and bicycle along streets that are inviting and safe. A recent CDC-funded study estimated that traffic danger inhibited approximately 40% of children from walking or bicycling to school.¹³ Older Americans make just 8% of their trips on foot or bike – far less than in some European countries, where 50% of seniors' trips use these active modes. Installation of a bicycle lane has been shown to increase bicycling by 23%.¹⁴ Some characteristics of safe and inviting streets include sidewalks that are in good condition and have curb cuts, traffic that is moving at a slow to moderate speed, and sidewalks and streets designed to separate pedestrians and bicyclists from motor vehicle traffic. Safe streets encourage walking and limit injury and death – over 55% of all pedestrian deaths occur in neighborhoods with no sidewalks or otherwise inadequate pedestrian accommodations.¹⁵ Amenities including trees, benches, and public art are also utilized by planners to encourage foot traffic. Residents who live in communities with pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly infrastructure tend to be more physically active.¹⁶ In fact, residents in a highly walkable neighborhood have been shown to engage in about 70 more minutes per week of moderate and vigorous physical activity than residents in a low-walkability neighborhood.¹⁷

Closely interrelated with the streetscape, destinations within walkable and/or bikeable distances can encourage physical activity. As noted in a study in the *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* and confirmed in a review by *The Synthesis Project*, built environment features such as close proximity to desirable (and useful) destinations such as stores and services have been strongly associated with people walking and bicycling as a means of

HEALTHY LAND USE

transportation.^{18,19} This finding is consistent with studies from urban planning literature about the potential health benefits of “mixed-use” development (building communities with nonresidential destinations within walking distance of housing).²⁰

Contrary to some popular stereotypes, bicycling is not just a middle-class choice. For example, *Bicycling Magazine* recently profiled “Invisible Riders” (low-income Latino immigrant cyclists), and a recent survey conducted by the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition found that 40% of on-street respondents (many of whom reported bicycling 5 days a week or more) earned less than \$15,000 annually (65% earned below \$35,000).²¹ Another study analyzed demographic data from the U.S. Census and found that younger, “carless” bicycle commuters exceeded the number of more affluent, older commuters.²² The bicycle commuters had lower incomes than others in their age group, and Latinos, Native Americans, and Asians were more likely to bicycle-commute than whites.²³

Potential Partners for Creating Walkable and Bikeable Neighborhoods

- Department of Transportation
- Local businesses
- Public agencies (Public Works and Parks and Recreation)
- City planners
- CalTrans
- State and local governments
- Parent advocacy groups
- Bicycle coalitions
- Public Health Department
- Senior citizen groups
- School staff
- Chambers of Commerce/Local business associations
- Community Clinics
- Local chapters of national organizations such as the American Lung Association

Strategies

• Complete streets policies

Complete streets is a regulatory strategy to ensure that all roads provide routine accommodation for all users, including bicyclists, transit users, and pedestrians of *all ages and abilities*, by including or enhancing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure during routine road maintenance and repair, new construction, and redesign. Comprehensive complete streets solutions include traffic-calming measures such as widening sidewalks, raising medians, and narrowing roadways; placing bus stops in safe and convenient locations; and making various improvements (e.g., refuge medians) for disabled travelers. All of these solutions play a role in reducing the number of crashes and reducing pedestrian risk of injury.²⁴ An overview of effective complete street policies and activities that improve safety, address climate change and oil dependence, and foster strong communities is available at <http://www.completestreets.org/complete-streets-fundamentals/factsheets/>

HEALTHY LAND USE

Complete streets policy initiatives are aimed at shifting the billions of dollars allocated through federal transportation legislation that are currently spent nearly exclusively on motor vehicle-oriented infrastructure to also support activity-friendly rights-of-way. Specific advocacy efforts focus on modifying policies and practices of departments of transportation and planning to accommodate all users. Early successes have been achieved at state and/or local levels in communities across the country.^{25,26} The results of a recent white paper indicate that innovative transportation planning – including complete streets – saves the residents of Portland, Oregon more than \$2.5 billion each year in gas and time.²⁷ The stage is set for substantive advancement of Complete Streets in California. Not only have jurisdictions such as Sacramento County (tax ordinance), Santa Barbara (General Plan), and San Francisco (regional policy) taken innovative policy steps, the Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358) requires that beginning January 2011, any substantive revision of the circulation element in the general plan of all California local governments will include complete streets provisions. In California, the Local Government Commission has been a leading voice and coordinating agency in support of complete streets. The information and resources from their 2009 Complete Streets workshop are available at <http://www.lgc.org/events/past/completestreets09agenda.html>

- **Safe routes to school**

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a national effort to ensure that children can walk and bicycle safely to school. The goal is to increase the number of children who walk or bicycle to school by removing the barriers that currently prevent them from doing so, including lack of or unsafe infrastructure, lack of adult supervision, and a lack of school and community support. In Marin County, over a two-year span, the SRTS program documented a 64% increase in the number of children walking, a 114% increase in the number of students biking, a 91% increase in the number of students carpooling, and a 39% decrease in the number of children arriving by private car carrying only one student.²⁸ Information about their model program can be found at <http://www.saferoutestoschools.org/index.shtml>

The SRTS National Coalition and supporters successfully advocated for a federal allocation of \$612 million over five years from SAFETEA-LU, which is distributed to each state department of transportation. The funds have been issued in California for eight years, and in August 2009, CalTrans awarded \$48.5 million in grants to support SRTS. Some advocates also see potential in using the safe routes notion as a building block for complete streets by supporting campaigns such as safe routes to health care, transit, food, and parks. For a step-by-step guide to starting an SRTS Program, see <http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/steps/index.cfm>

- **Connect roadways to complementary systems of trails and bicycle paths**

Active transportation systems consist of seamless networks of accessible trails, sidewalks, and on-road bike facilities and provide safe connections between community destinations such as parks, schools, retail stores, and workplaces. Walking and bicycle paths, trails, and greenways that are separated from traffic will enable people, including children and seniors, to walk or bicycle safely from one place to another.

HEALTHY LAND USE

The Seattle Department of Transportation implemented a comprehensive urban trail system that connects the corners of the city with downtown Seattle (http://preventioninstitute.org/pdf/BE_Seattle_WA.pdf, chapter 9). By converting abandoned rails into trails, the city provides access to recreational activities, promotes bicycling as a viable transportation option, and links neighborhoods, parks, and open spaces throughout Seattle in a way that reduces unintentional injuries from motor vehicle crashes²⁹ The rails to trails model can be expanded to include utility and sewer rights of way to create full bicycle trail networks.

In many cases, facilities for walking and biking exist but are in disrepair or are unsafe. Local residents can work together with local businesses and public agencies (such as Public Works and Parks and Recreation) to document and remedy problems. In Madera, California, the Obesity Prevention Council has worked closely with law enforcement to identify safety barriers to physical activity, particularly for youth.³⁰ In Kern County, the Greenfield Walking Group began with two dozen women, many of them farm workers, meeting for a daily walk in a local park. Facing hazardous conditions, the women began to demand improved conditions at the park and ended up not only transforming the park, but inspiring efforts in communities across the Central Valley to increase access to safe places for physical activity (http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_2.php) (http://www.preventioninstitute.org/documents/NPA_RWJMAPKernCo_080808.pdf).

- **Adoption of pedestrian and bicycle master plans**

Generally developed at a local or regional level, bicycle and pedestrian plans can be integrated into local city plans and capital improvement programs to reflect a commitment to increasing walking and bicycling. Pedestrian and bicycle plans tend to articulate goals for increasing trips by foot and bicycle, safety, accessibility, and connectivity of passages for pedestrians and bicyclists. The City of Sacramento's Pedestrian Friendly Street Standards is a useful model (<http://cityofsacramento.org/dsd/reference/resolutions-and-ordinances/documents/Resolution-2004-118-Pedestrian-Friendly-Street-Standards.pdf>) as is the City of Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan (<http://www.longbeach.gov/gov/bmp.asp>)

Many California cities and counties have or are in the process of developing Bicycle Master Plans. In some cases, such as in Fresno County, these planning efforts are undertaken to increase access to public funds, including CalTrans Bicycle Transportation Account grants. These planning processes create an opportunity to bring necessary funds into local communities and also to raise the profile of non-motorized travel and engage a range of stakeholders.

State and local governments can encourage pedestrian and bicycle planning by: 1) integrating pedestrian and bicycle design guidelines into transportation planning practice; 2) dedicating a larger share of transportation funding to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, as well as making sure all projects include basic accommodation for all modes; and 3) encouraging all localities to both develop plans and fund implementation.³¹

HEALTHY LAND USE

Increasing the number of cyclists and pedestrians raises the demand for improvements to the built environment. Programmatic examples such as bicycle safety trainings that prepare and build the confidence of the average bicyclist and Bike to Work days that raise the profile of bike riding and introduce new riders can support planning and infrastructure improvement efforts.

- **Renovate or rebuild schools in locations that encourage walking, bicycling, and use of public transit and that minimize exposure to hazards such as air pollution.**

State and local-level decisions regarding school siting, construction, and design have significant impacts on the health of students and staff. Ideally, schools are centers for the community and are located within walking and bicycling distance of the students whom the schools serve and are well-connected to public transit. In addition, schools should be sited away from freeways, industrial sites, toxic waste, superfund sites, etc. In Los Angeles, the Belmont Learning Complex (dubbed “America’s Most Expensive School”) was to be built on a former industrial site that still contained crude oil, benzene, methane, hydrogen sulfide, and volatile compounds such as acetone. It took the actions of community advocates and new members of the board of education to halt the project.³²

In many locales, incentives that are set up to encourage new, large-footprint school construction projects need to be reversed in favor of schools that are integrated into communities and easily accessible. In addition to supporting physical activity through walking and biking, neighborhood-based schools reduce safety and climate impacts of driving and increase opportunities to use school facilities for community benefit through joint-use and other agreements. Oregon has a very instructive school-siting handbook (<http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/TGM/docs/schoolsitinghandbook.pdf>)

B. Public Transit

Public transit is essential because it encourages physical activity, decreases vehicle miles traveled (reducing traffic injuries and fatalities, greenhouse gas emissions, and stress levels), and connects low-income people to employment and services. An environment that supports access to alternative modes of transportation other than cars can help people maintain an active lifestyle. Built environment features that place bus or train stops within walking distance of housing, offices, retail, and open spaces make it more convenient for people who live or work in these communities to travel on foot or by public transportation instead of by car. A recent study found that people who use public transit walk more on a daily basis than non-transit users – transit users walked an average of 25 minutes to and from public transit.³³ According to the Transit Cooperative Research Program, there has also been a significant growth in bicycle and transit integration, which has contributed to the increased use of bicycles to reach transit stations and the growing availability of bicycle racks on buses over the last few years.³⁴

HEALTHY LAND USE

Potential Partners for Maximizing Public Transit

- CalTrans
- Public agencies (Public Works and Parks and Recreation)
- Transit workers unions
- City planners
- State and local governments
- Redevelopment agencies
- Local businesses
- Transit coalitions
- Economic development organizations
- Student organizations
- Environmental groups
- Climate change advocates
- Metropolitan Planning Commissions

Lower rates of car ownership make affordable public transportation an essential mode of transportation in low-income communities. However, transportation systems do not consistently provide low-income people with convenient and practical access to their jobs and healthcare.³⁵ A 1996 report by the Federal Transit Administration found that nearly one-third of the American population, predominantly children, seniors, people with disabilities, low-income people, women, and rural residents are transportation-disadvantaged.³⁶

Strategies

• **Affordable and reliable multi-modal public transportation options**

Investments in public transportation are needed to make public transit fast, affordable, high-quality, and accessible to all residents. Particularly in urban areas, quality public transit systems enable residents to reap the benefits of increased levels of daily walking that are associated with public transit use. A variety of modes, including paratransit, rapid bus, and light rail, are needed to form a strong network of public transportation options. All transit modes need to implement design standards to ensure access for people with disabilities. Public transit routes need to be planned to provide frequent service to worksites, food retail, health care, parks and recreation facilities, and other important destinations. Public transit use can be increased through seamless intermodal connections (e.g., between light rail lines, bus stops, bicycling, and pedestrian paths). The success of public transit efforts is dependent upon density, and coordination of transportation and land use planning is critical in order to achieve thriving public transit systems.

• **Transit-oriented development**

Transit-oriented development (TOD) is described as “moderate-to-higher-density development, located within an easy walk of a major transit stop, generally with a mix of residential, employment, and shopping opportunities designed for pedestrians without excluding the auto. TOD can be new construction or redevelopment of one or more buildings whose design and orientation facilitate transit use.”³⁷ TOD situates housing, services, and amenities within walking distance – potentially reducing automobile use and resulting traffic crashes, greenhouse gas emissions, and stress – and serving as a hub for social interaction, employment, and small business

HEALTHY LAND USE

development; and supporting a sense of community identity. TOD projects require numerous partners and significant, creative planning and funding. No two projects follow the same course, and each project must be responsive to local needs and be careful to protect local resources. For an overview of projects around the state, go to <http://transitorienteddevelopment.dot.ca.gov/project/NewViewAllProjects.jsp>

In addition, specific communities such as Los Angeles have developed resources to support TOD. For examples, see <http://www.travelmatters.org/about/losangeles?sid=e4fb750942cf028b764528392b37b522>

C. Parks, Recreation, Open Space

Parks and recreation facilities (including playgrounds, sports areas, and public pools) have numerous health benefits including:

- Open space provides people with a place where they can engage in active play such as sports, leisurely strolls, or bicycle rides along trails and greenways. Use of parks has been shown to correlate with improvements in both measured (body mass index, blood pressure, and depression) and perceived health.³⁸
- Outdoor play, particularly among children, is associated with higher levels of physical activity and improved cognitive development.^{39,40} Playgrounds provide an outdoor environment where children can actively engage in physical activity and participate in more informal, unstructured play experiences.
- The Task Force on Community Preventive Services reported that there is strong evidence supporting creation and/or enhancement of places for physical activity as an effective intervention for increasing physical activity levels.⁴¹
- Access to even limited amounts of green space has been shown to support lowered mental fatigue and better coping skills among public housing residents.⁴²
- Parks and other green spaces reduce climate change impacts by absorbing heat and greenhouse gases.⁴³

Potential Partners for Increasing, Improving, and Encouraging Use of Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Open Space

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| • Local parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities | • Redevelopment agencies |
| • Trust for Public Lands | • Community coalitions |
| • Non-profit recreation programming organizations | • Professional sports franchises |
| • Local schools | • Public health departments |
| • Public agencies (Parks and Recreation) | • Walking groups |
| • City planners | • Local business associations |
| • State and local governments | |

HEALTHY LAND USE

Places for physical activity are not distributed evenly among communities. Several studies have documented inequities in access to parks and open space, finding that low-income individuals and people of color are less likely to have access to parks and other types of physical activity settings (such as bicycle trails and public pools) than whites and those from more affluent communities.^{44,45} People with the greatest access to open space walked at recommended levels (moderate to vigorous activity for 30 minutes) – 47% more than those with the least access.⁴⁶

There are also differences in access to playgrounds and in the maintenance of playgrounds between low-income and high-income neighborhoods. In many low-income communities, public playgrounds may be few, but schools can play a role in offering their playgrounds during out-of-school hours. When parks are available, safety-related barriers to physical activity result in residents often limiting their time in public spaces to reduce their risk of experiencing violent crime.⁴⁷ (Note: In this guide, we have not dealt with *private* physical activity spaces, e.g., gymnasiums, in part because they tend to be less available to low-income populations. However, there are some opportunities and strategies that could be explored to encourage further accessibility of these resources into low-income communities and communities of color.)

Strategies

- **Provide local parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities in currently underserved residential areas.**

Public financing of parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities can occur locally and at the state level. Numerous financing mechanisms exist for the creation, operation, and maintenance of parks, which include but are not limited to, sales and use taxes, bonds, parcel taxes, special assessments, and benefit assessments. There are distinctions between the mechanisms with regard to how funds will be used. For example, sales and parcel taxes and special assessments can be used for capital expenditures, operations, and maintenance, while park finance measures (e.g., bonds) are generally reserved for capital expenditures to create new parks. On a smaller scale, local funds can be used to secure land in low-income areas for uses such as community gardens, pocket parks, and playgrounds. In some cases, plots of land are held by public agencies and can be developed as park space through no-cost agreements and leases.

There are challenges in developing parks in underserved areas, including issues around usage and safety. Efforts should include community engagement in planning, designing, building, and investing in parks and playgrounds, as it increases community ownership, which can lead to increased use, sustainability, willingness to maintain, safety, and decreased misuse and vandalism. The Trust for Public Land's Parks for People program is a useful resource that offers evidence of the value of parks and tools for advocating for parks in underserved communities (http://www.tpl.org/tier2_pa.cfm?folder_id=705).

HEALTHY LAND USE

- **Joint use agreements**

Joint use agreements can take many forms. Most relevant to health is the opening of public schools and facilities for public recreational use. Examples include agreements opening up school playgrounds and gymnasiums after school hours for community use or giving schools access to a city park if they do not have a play area on campus. The concept is simple: share resources to keep costs down and communities healthy. Joint use is happening in cities throughout California and across the nation. In fact, the concept of joint use is not new. Schools have shared their land and facilities for community use for over 200 years. Many states have policies to encourage schools to make facilities open to the public. In California close to 60% of responding school districts already have some type of joint use partnership, but thousands still do not and many of the existing partnerships could be strengthened or expanded.⁴⁸

Joint use partnerships can be formal (based on a legal document) or informal (based on a handshake), but formal agreements offer increased protections for both the facility and the community group using the facility. Agreements need to account for issues such as operational costs, liability, and maintenance. Profiles of successful agreements in Chula Vista, Pixley, and Fresno can be viewed at <http://www.jointuse.org/resources/success-spotlight/>. In Pixley, for example, an agreement between Pixley Union School District and a local Ballet Folklorico, allowed the dance group to use the school's gym while expanding opportunities for students to participate in the Ballet Folklorico's after-school program.

- **Require new housing developments to incorporate recreation and open space for activity.**

At the local level, developer fees can be levied to ensure that housing developments provide open spaces for activity or play within the development as well as safe, attractive pathways for public use around the development. Incentives such as density bonuses* or expeditious permits are complementary strategies to punitive measures. At the state and federal level, decisions about whether to fund public housing developments can (and in some cases do) give points or preference to plans that include infrastructure for physical activity such as swimming pools, playgrounds, and/or walking routes.

- **Offer parks and recreation programming that encourages and supports physical activity.**

Once parks are in place, parks and recreation programming (such as swimming, youth sports, dance classes, etc.) serves as a magnet for community members to use the park. In fact, programming is not only a means to increase park use, but it is an important mechanism to increase park safety, as parks are typically safer when more people are using them. Lack of structured programming can often lead to more frequent misuse of parks. Programming is generally offered by community-based organizations, local parks and recreation departments, and local health departments. For example, the South Bronx Active Living Campaign facilitates recreation programming for adults and children through a partnership of nonprofits, educational institutions, and other organizations. (<http://www.activelivingbydesign.org/communities/profiles/bronx-ny>).

* An incentive-based approach which increases the number of market-rate units on the site, in order to provide an incentive for the construction of affordable housing.

HEALTHY LAND USE

- **Increase access to national and state park systems among people from low-income communities and communities of color.**

One major challenge for low-income communities is their inability to access state and national parks. Lack of transportation is an issue, and strategies need to focus on creating ways to enable these populations to access the parks. Walking/bicycle trails and greenways linking to parks are part of the solution when locations are within a few miles. For longer distances, a more promising strategy would address public transit concerns and work on improving people’s ability to travel to parks by bus. This would require creative partnerships among local non-profits that serve these communities, national/state park services, and public transit agencies.

D. Safety: Violence and Perceived Violence

Violence is a constant concern in communities across California – it exacerbates health inequities and is a leading cause of injury, disability, and premature death. The health consequences for those who are injured or exposed to violence are severe and can include serious physical injuries, post-traumatic stress syndrome, depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and other longer-term health problems.⁴⁹ In addition, the social impacts of violence – diminished academic achievement and worker productivity, the deterioration of families and communities – are substantial and costly.⁵⁰

Violence affects health both directly through injuries and also as a result of restrictions on physical, economic, and social activity due to perceptions of violence. The perception of violence has been shown to discourage physical activity more than actual crime rates and neighborhood quality do.¹²⁶ The perception of violence can alter walking patterns and discourage people from shopping in their neighborhoods. Reduced commercial activity means less foot traffic and an increased likelihood of crime and violent incidents, making it even harder for the remaining businesses to thrive, thereby contributing to a downward development cycle. This is an equity issue – twice as many low-income respondents as moderate-income respondents to a recent survey worried about safety in their neighborhoods.⁵¹

Potential Partners for Preventing Violence

- Developers
- City planners
- Local civic organizations
- Local parks, playgrounds, and recreation facilities
- Local schools
- Local elected officials
- Law enforcement
- Community coalitions
- Youth development organizations
- Community watch programs
- Boys and Girls Clubs
- YMCA
- Faith leaders
- Public health department

HEALTHY LAND USE

The intersection between safety and the built environment requires diverse sectors (such as public health, planners, transportation engineers, public works, school officials, law enforcement, and community groups) to work in partnership together. One such intersectoral partnership is Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).[†] Built environment strategies are only one part of a comprehensive approach to preventing violence – these strategies on their own may have the effect of improving conditions on one street or in one area, but the complexity of preventing violence in a community requires multifaceted strategies. For an example of how Chula Vista youth used CPTED principals to reclaim their neighborhood park, see http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_1.php. For a more detailed presentation of a comprehensive approach to preventing violence, see the Resource Guide for Outcome Five – “*Children and Their Families Are Safe from Violence in Their Homes and Neighborhoods.*”

Strategies

- **Eyes on the street**

In her seminal work, “*The Death and Life of Great American Cities,*” sociologist Jane Jacobs argued that “A well-used city street is apt to be a safe street. A deserted city street is apt to be unsafe.” She coined the term “eyes on the street” to refer not only to pedestrians on the street but also buildings that are designed so that windows face the street, shops have entrances that are open to the street, front yards and stoops are in use, and there are places for people to congregate.⁵² Eyes on the Street, or natural surveillance, is a key concept among public health, planning, and law enforcement professionals exploring the relationship between the built environment and safety.

Key steps toward creating eyes on the street include:

- Buildings must be facing the street.
- There should be eyes upon the street from the buildings lining the street.
- The sidewalk should be used continuously, at nearly all hours.
- Children are able to play on sidewalks and streets.
- Neighborhood streets should be as narrow as possible and accommodate only slow-moving traffic.
- A large number of shops and public places, particularly those that are bustling at night, should be sprinkled throughout a neighborhood.
- Good lighting.⁵³

[†] CPTED is a popular multidisciplinary framework that has been implemented in numerous communities. Initially, CPTED focused on issues such as surveillance and access control. While making improvements in these areas can have an effect on crime (and, of great importance, bring law enforcement into a discussion with city planners about preventive strategies), they do not get at the root causes of violence. Current thinking about CPTED reflects a broader and more nuanced understanding of the relationship between design and violence, in particular the need to promote social cohesion and interaction and includes diverse principles including:

- human scale development - size of the district, density, and differentiation of dwellings
- Urban meeting places
- Youth clubs
- Resident’s participation
- Resident’s responsibility[†]

HEALTHY LAND USE

- **Safe community places for youth**

The National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine both concluded that positive environments can promote youth development and desired outcomes, such as safety and academic achievement. The features of these settings are: physical and psychological safety, appropriate structure, supportive relationships, opportunities to belong, positive social norms, support for efficacy and mattering, opportunities for skill building, and integration of family, school, and community efforts.⁵⁴ These places can be school-based, community or youth centers, and facilities operated by independent not-for-profits. There are a number of innovative examples in California of programs and facilities that engage youth in positive activities and foster healthy development, including Youth UpRising in Oakland (<http://www.youthuprising.org/index.html>) and Homeboy Industries in Los Angeles (<http://www.homeboy-industries.org/>).

- **Reduce density of alcohol outlets**

The availability of alcohol in a community has a demonstrated correlation with multiple forms of violence and injuries, including homicide, motor vehicle crashes, sexual violence, and suicide.^{55,56} Additionally, reduction in the density of alcohol outlets has been shown to result in local reductions in violent crime.^{57,58} The process of reducing alcohol outlets culminates in regulating specific outlets and changing zoning ordinances and other land-use policy, but also involves educating community members, building partnerships and networks, and enlisting the support of community leaders (businesses, faiths, parents, etc.). The Community Coalition of South Los Angeles has built a reputation for effectiveness in closing alcohol outlets (and/or encouraging proprietors to sell healthier products) and has developed a number of invaluable resources (<http://cocosouthla.org/media/landusehandbook>).

- **Blight reduction/public art**

The physical appearance of a community has an influence on how safe residents feel. Certain elements of the community environment, including broken windows, brownfields, vacant lots, graffiti, abandoned houses and cars, and litter, contribute to the feeling of an unsafe neighborhood and communicate that a community is not cared for and does not care for its residents. Such perceptions lead residents away from using public facilities and attending public gatherings. When there is a perception of improved safety, positive behavioral change results. For example, New York City's subway system had significant increases in usage at all hours after efforts were made to improve the physical facilities and reduce perceptions of disrepair and danger. Some strategies that have been documented as contributing to this include better enforcement of laws against minor offenses, removing graffiti, fixing broken windows, and cleaning litter.⁵⁹

Public art can have the opposite effect of blight – cultivating pride in a community, a sense that the environment is cared for, and offering focal points for gathering. A couple of innovative examples of public art include a San Francisco effort to melt guns into art (<http://www.meltguns.com/index.html>) and Philadelphia's citywide mural initiative (http://preventioninstitute.org/pdf/BE_Philadelphia_PA.pdf, chapter 11).

HEALTHY LAND USE

- **Neighborhood focal points**

A focal point is a well-known, accessible location within a neighborhood that provides a sense of community identity and a venue for social interaction and information sharing. Possible focal points include parks, supermarkets, plazas, and community centers. Focal points support safety because they encourage eyes on the street, build social interaction and cohesion, and provide safe environments for all ages. Community members participating in a community-driven livability initiative in the unincorporated areas of Alameda County (the Eden Area Livability Initiative) identified neighborhood focal points as an important need. As a result of an extensive prioritization, discussion, and voting process, five catalyst livability projects were identified including a neighborhood community center that would serve as a focal point and provide services and opportunities for local residents of all ages. More details are available at http://preventioninstitute.org/documents/EALI_final_report_0309_000.pdf

E. Healthful Food Environments

The research is clear – the environment plays a significant role in shaping the food choices of individuals and communities. Imbalances between healthful and unhealthy food vendors have significant implications for health. Lack of grocery stores and other healthy food retailers in economically disadvantaged communities limits access to fresh, high-quality, affordable foods. To make matters worse, the ubiquity of fast food and junk food – high in calories, sugar, fat, and salt – in all communities, low-income ones in particular, has a detrimental impact on community health and well-being. When communities lack healthy food and are overburdened by fast food and junk foods, residents’ diets suffer. Strategies that improve access to wholesome, fresh food and limit highly processed, convenience foods in the places that we live, work, learn, and play are central to improving individuals’ food choices and reducing chronic disease.

Potential Partners for Healthful Food Environments

- Local government officials
- Farmers’ markets
- Local farmers
- Environmentalist groups
- Transportation experts
- City Planning Department
- City Redevelopment Agency
- Department of Public Health
- Parks and Recreation Department
- Community-based organizations
- Local food policy council
- Corner store associations
- Business Improvement Districts
- Community food advocates
- Community clinics
- WIC Local Vendor Liaison (LVL)
- WIC program participants
- Farmers
- Wholesale produce distributors
- Youth centers
- Farmers market organizers/associations
- Community foundations

HEALTHY LAND USE

A recent comprehensive review found that residents who have access to supermarkets tend to have healthier diets, and residents who have better access to grocery stores and limited access to convenience stores tend to have lower levels of obesity.⁶⁰ National and local studies suggest that low-income, minority, and rural neighborhoods are most impacted by poor access to supermarkets and healthful food.⁶¹ In California, low-income neighborhoods have higher ratios of fast food and convenience stores compared to supermarkets and produce vendors.⁶² Faced with an unhealthy food environment, low-income households also face the greatest challenges in going out of the neighborhood to shop as they are six to seven times less likely to own a car.^{63,64} Few public transportation systems have planned their routes to ensure convenient direct access to grocery stores for transit users.

At the same time that low-income neighborhoods and communities of color lack access to healthy food retailers, they often have a glut of heavily marketed fast food outlets and convenience stores featuring sweetened beverages, alcohol, tobacco, and junk foods. A 2008 California study found that people who live near an abundance of fast-food restaurants and convenience stores compared to grocery stores and fresh produce vendors, have a significantly higher prevalence of obesity and diabetes.⁶⁵ One recent study among middle and high school students in California found that students with nearby fast food restaurants consumed fewer servings of fruits and vegetables and more servings of soda.⁶⁶ Estimates show that 48 cents of every food dollar spent in the United States go to the restaurant industry.⁶⁷ With Americans consuming so many meals outside the home, offering healthier choices, especially on children's menus, and keeping the prices of healthy items affordable, can encourage better dietary habits. Low-income, urban communities of color also have higher numbers of convenience stores, which tend to offer high-calorie, low-nutrient foods.^{68,69} While a reliance on smaller stores can mean that people face higher prices, less variety, and lower quality and quantity of healthy foods, it is important to note that there are some low-income neighborhoods where retailers feature affordable produce and ingredients for the traditional ethnic diets of neighborhood residents.

The foods that end up in neighborhood stores and restaurants are the endpoint of a broader food system. This system not only impacts the nutritional quality of the food supply, it has far-reaching effects on the environment that impact our health. The current industrial food system, with its heavy reliance on fossil fuels, pesticides and fertilizers, antibiotics, and intensive farming practices pollutes the air, water, and soil, harms farm animals, and endangers the health of those who work to feed us.⁷⁰ Policy decisions at the federal, state, and local level influence the elements of the food system. Taking a systems approach to local food environments provides an opportunity to work across sectors – linking community residents with public health, environmentalists, planners, agriculture, sustainable food systems, economic development and transportation experts to develop local policy that fosters access to healthful food and a food system where food is produced, processed, transported, and marketed in ways that are environmentally sound, sustainable, and just.

HEALTHY LAND USE

Strategies**• Offer retailers incentives from local government.**

Local political leadership, the active involvement of key decision-makers, and responsive action by city planning and economic development agencies can bolster store development. Public agencies that aggressively recruit potential stores and provide financial and regulatory incentives and site-related assistance can make potential locations more attractive investments. Specifically, local government can speed up grocery store development by simplifying applications and permitting procedures, by providing tax exemptions to attract businesses to distressed communities, and by helping food retailers secure land. In order to encourage development in denser inner-city areas, store operators may also need permit variances for elements such as reducing parking space requirements or allowing expanded hours of operation.

The City of Chicago has developed a Retail Chicago Program that serves as a “one-stop” shop for retailers interested in operating in Chicago. Retail Chicago offers services such as a single resource for inquiries about development opportunities and customized market information on specific communities. The Retail Chicago program has conducted targeted outreach campaign to supermarket operators. In many cases it takes an organized effort involving many stakeholders (including elected officials, public agency staff, and community advocates) to bring in new retail establishments. For example, in the Upper Falls community of Rochester, New York, it took over five years for a dynamic collaborative of community members to bring a full-service supermarket into a community which lacked a single grocery store (http://preventioninstitute.org/pdf/BE_Rochester_NY.pdf, pages 10-14).

• Support corner stores to provide more healthful food options.

Loans, training, special permitting provisions, and local advertising can be attractive incentives to provide more healthful food options, especially for small businesses. The Good Neighbor Food Project in the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood of San Francisco was initiated by concerned residents and Literacy for Environmental Justice to recruit merchants to become “Good Neighbors” and it offers businesses, including restaurants, markets, and corner stores, free energy efficiency retrofits, cooperative buying opportunities, in-store promotions, and other inducements to carry healthy products. The initiative seeks to reduce alcohol and tobacco marketing while increasing access to produce in the neighborhood. The initiative involved collaboration between the San Francisco’s Health Department, Redevelopment Agency, and Small Business Development Center, and a community organization, Literacy for Environmental Justice (<http://www.lejyouth.org/programs/food.html>).

Success stories and resources for healthy food in small stores can be found on the Healthy Corner Stores Network website (<http://healthycornerstores.org/>).

Examples of city policies can be found in the City of Arcata General Plan, which, in addition to healthy food retail concerns, addresses numerous other built environment factors (<http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdf/text/ArcGenPln.pdf>).

HEALTHY LAND USE

In California, Kettleman City, South Los Angeles, and Baldwin Park, communities successfully facilitated corner store conversions. To learn more about these local success stories go to <http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3.php> <http://www.centralvalleybusinesstimes.com/stories/001/?ID=13351>

- **Establish restrictions on sales and marketing of unhealthy food.**

Formula retail and restaurant ordinances are being used to limit the density of fast-food chains and liquor outlets or to set minimum distances from specific sites such as schools.[‡] Conditional use permits (CUPs) are one way for a municipality to control certain “nuisance” businesses that have specific public health risks (e.g., fast-food restaurants, liquor stores, auto repair shops, and dry cleaners). To broaden community access to healthy foods, particularly in neighborhoods that lack big grocery stores, local governments can require corner stores or liquor stores to devote a percentage of shelf space to fruits, vegetables, and other healthy foods to improve residents’ access to healthier food items. Most cities have some form of a CUP in their zoning ordinance, but their uses are varied. Zoning laws can also be used to restrict the distance that certain products can be sold from certain other institutions such as schools and churches. In some cases, local governments have enacted specific policies restricting unhealthy food. For example, in Los Angeles, the City Council recently enacted a one-year moratorium on new fast-food restaurants in the South LA neighborhood.⁷¹ Similarly, the city of Arcata enacted a policy that limits the number of formula restaurants (i.e., fast food) in the city to no more than nine at any one time. For more details on the Arcata policy, see <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdf/Humboldt%20Arcata%20Formula%20Restaurant%20Ban.pdf>

Public Health Law & Policy has published a model California municipal ordinance containing policy language for establishing healthy food standards that must be met by chain restaurants providing children’s snacks, beverages, and meals with a giveaway (<http://www.phlpnet.org/phlp/products/model-california-ordinance-regulating-chain-restaurant-giveaways-children’s-meals>).

- **Preserve farmland on the urban and suburban fringes and in prime growing areas.**

Farmland preservation within urban and suburban fringes promotes regional agriculture, provides land for growing food, and helps prevent sprawl. Land trusts are one partnership mechanism to keep farmlands in operation. Preventing expansion at the urban and suburban fringe through policies like in-fill development is an important strategy. Maintaining existing farmland at the urban or suburban fringe also requires policy attention to ensure farming operations are compatible with neighboring developments (i.e., operations do not pollute the air, water, and soil near schools and housing). An emerging area of interest is the intersection of farmland preservation, open space, recreation, and park development efforts and their relationship to health. The County of Ventura’s enactment of Save Open-Space and Agricultural Resources (SOAR) serves as a prominent example. The SOAR policy limits urban sprawl and promotes sustainable communities by giving citizens in Ventura County the right to vote

[‡] Requires that any retail establishment, including food service/fast food outlets, that must adhere to a standard - or formula - for marketing, sales, or signage can only locate in specified areas of the city and only when granted a conditional use permit by the city.

HEALTHY LAND USE

before development takes place on open space and agricultural lands within the county (<http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdf/VenturaCountySOAR.pdf>).

In the Sacramento Region, Valley Vision initiated the Valuing Agriculture Initiative to bring farmers and ranchers together with policymakers, planners, and community leaders to develop agriculture preservation strategies that focus on environmental and economic sustainability. The efforts to preserve agricultural lands have been bolstered by a focus on increasing local access to healthy foods as a means to reduce health disparities.⁷²

- **Expand community gardens and urban agriculture.**

Community gardens and urban agriculture (commercial farming in urban areas) are land use planning strategies for improving neighborhood food access and providing increased opportunities for physical activity. They provide a healthy source of produce for residents and reinforce the practice of behaviors such as eating healthily, gardening, and walking. An additional benefit is that community gardens beautify the neighborhood and provide an environment where people are more likely to enjoy spending time.

Many innovative school and community gardening programs exist in cities throughout California, including Oakland, Berkeley, Glendale, Delano, and Loma Linda. Gardening programs have also been established in Seattle, Denver, Brooklyn, and other cities throughout the country. There are general perceptions that the programs have not been brought to full-scale, particularly across the breadth of very low-income and food-insecure communities, and that there is potential for a broader impact. Community gardens and gardeners can be both positively and negatively impacted by local land use issues and policies (e.g., temporary and low-cost leases, marginal land, and in-kind use of city resources for irrigation and maintenance), and development pressures (e.g., evictions are common). An example of supportive policies can be found in the Sacramento City General Plan, where the city will “provide venues for farmers’ markets, particularly in areas that lack access to fresh and healthy foods, and encourage serving locally grown and organic foods at City public facilities,” as well as support community and rooftop gardens (http://www.sacgp.org/documents/04_Part2.08_EnvironmentalResources.pdf). Also, the City of Escondido has enacted an Interim Land Use Policy (an administrative procedure permitting specific limited-time uses of public and private property) that allows public use of vacant lots for community purposes, including gardens, recreational space, or temporary public art displays (<http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdf/InterimLandUsePolicy.pdf>).

- **Ensure that grocery stores and small stores are equipped to accept the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) benefits.[§]**

Storeowners can benefit from training and help to become certified to receive SNAP and WIC benefits. Making sure that small grocers accept SNAP and WIC benefits serves two purposes –

[§] Requires that any retail establishment, including food service/fast food outlets, that must adhere to a standard - or formula - for marketing, sales, or signage can only locate in specified areas of the city and only when granted a conditional use permit by the city.

HEALTHY LAND USE

it provides a more convenient location for food shopping for low-income people, and it brings revenue to local shops. In addition, it is also important to work with storeowners to help them stock high-quality produce and other healthy foods. The upgrade to the WIC food package, which now includes vouchers for fruits and vegetables, is a potential opportunity to reach out to small storeowners to expand the availability of healthful items. The Healthy Purchase Pilot, a program enacted in 2008 through AB 2726, is designed to increase access and affordability of fresh produce for SNAP recipients by providing a financial incentive delivered by the Food Stamp Electronic Benefit Card.⁷³ Given fiscal limitations, the State of California has not appropriated money for the program. However, this bill was the inspiration for an incentive program to support healthful food purchases by SNAP recipients in the 2008 Farm Bill. California will be able to compete to receive a grant to implement the program on a pilot basis.

- **Accessing grants or loans to improve distribution of local foods to stores.**

Resources that help local and regional farms sell their products to small storeowners can increase neighborhood access to healthy foods while strengthening local food systems. The 2008 Farm Bill included two useful provisions on this front.⁷⁴ The Rural Business and Industries Loan and Loan Guarantee program provides financing for rural groups engaged in local or regional marketing, processing, and distribution (http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/rbs/busp/b&I_gar.htm). The Healthy Urban Food Enterprise Development Center, established within the USDA Cooperatives State, Education, Extension, and Research Service, provides outreach, technical assistance, and feasibility grants to enterprises that market healthy and locally produced foods to underserved neighborhoods.⁷⁵ California communities should continue to monitor federal legislation and administrative policy for updates and additions to these and other funding sources.

- **Invest in fresh food financing initiatives for grocery stores and small stores.**

Government investment can provide financing for supermarkets, grocery stores, and other healthy food retailers that plan to operate in underserved communities. The first statewide policy, passed in Pennsylvania in 2004, committed \$21.9 million in grants and loans. As of December 2008, the Pennsylvania initiative has provided \$38.9 million in grants and loans for healthy retail projects, resulting in the creation of 50 stores that offer fresh foods, 3,723 jobs, and 1.2 million square feet of floor space. The Pennsylvania initiative has led to growing interest in Fresh Food Financing among advocates from across the country. Fresh Food Financing Initiatives are being considered at the city level as well in New York City and Detroit. In 2007, California advocates supported a state bill, SB48 (Alquist), the Healthy Food Retail Innovations Fund, which did not pass due to lack of state funds for the initiative. If passed, it would have encouraged retail innovation (including supermarkets, grocery stores, farmers' markets, and mobile markets) in underserved areas of the state. A similar bill could be resubmitted at the state level or scaled down to a local version. Information about the bill can be found on the Center for Public Health Advocacy website. (<http://www.publichealthadvocacy.org/legislation07.html>).

- **Expand access to farmers' markets.**

The number of farmers' markets across California has expanded dramatically in the last five years. When low-income people have access to farmers' markets, they eat more fruits and

HEALTHY LAND USE

vegetables.⁷⁶ There are challenges in developing a sufficient customer base to attract farmers to locations in lower-income neighborhoods. Several features can enhance the markets' success: familiar products at good prices, community ownership, transportation, flexible hours, employing sales staff from the neighborhood, and discounts. Local, state, and federal governments can help cultivate and sustain farmers' markets, particularly in underserved communities. Often, it starts by eliminating zoning regulations that inadvertently prevent markets from opening.⁷⁷ A local government can designate land for a market, help prepare the site, keep parking and traffic flowing smoothly, facilitate cleanup,⁷⁸ sponsor advertising, and provide prominent signs.⁷⁹ In San Joaquin County, the Hunger Task Force has developed a Mobile Farmers Market to provide access to fresh fruits and vegetables in underserved neighborhoods.⁸⁰ Allowing for the use of Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) at a local flea market in Merced⁸¹ and on park grounds in downtown Ceres created thriving farmers' markets.⁸² The Kern County Public Health Department sponsors a farmers' market on Public Health Department premises, the first instance of this happening in California. A news article about this market is available at http://www.csufresno.edu/ccchhs/institutes_programs/CCROPP/news/Healthierchoices.pdf

Farm stands on school premises have been successfully implemented in the California cities of Fresno,⁸³ Oakland,⁸⁴ and Pixley.⁸⁵ The Fresno City Planning Commission amended the Fresno Municipal Code in June 2008 to remove zoning barriers for farmers' markets in certain zone districts within the city.⁸⁶ The actual policy language is available at <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdf/FresnoFarmersMarket.pdf>

The federal government oversees programs and funding streams that aid farmers' markets.⁸⁷ The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) provide direct federal support for qualifying individuals, in the form of special coupons to be used specifically at farmers' markets. In addition, as of December 2009, all WIC recipients will be receiving vouchers for fruits and vegetables as part of their monthly food package. The new food package regulations give state agencies the option of authorizing farmers to accept WIC vouchers for fruits and vegetables at farmers' markets.⁸⁸ The 2008 Farm Bill allocated \$33 million over five years to support marketing for farmers' markets, 10% of which is required to fund SNAP EBT implementation projects.⁸⁹ EBT implementation projects will ensure that vendors can accept SNAP, thus enabling lower-income residents to buy high-quality, healthy produce that they might not otherwise be able to afford.

- **Food policy councils**

To make healthy foods available and affordable to everyone, city, county, and state governments must look at the entire food system, from farm to plate. Typically, however, governments take a piecemeal approach, with different agencies responsible for various aspects of food policy.⁹⁰ Local and state governments can create and support food policy councils to focus attention on the entire system and foster collaboration among groups interested in public health, nutrition, sustainability, farmland preservation, healthy food retail, community gardens, farm worker rights, and economic development. The nonprofit Community Food Security Coalition estimates that more than 50 councils operate across the country. Some councils, sponsored by government

HEALTHY LAND USE

agencies, provide policy guidance. Others run by grassroots groups or non-profit organizations focus on advocating for policies and operating programs.⁹¹ A list of councils in California is available at <http://www.foodsecurity.org/FPC/council.html>

F. Land Use Policy

In every community in California, undeveloped land is being rapidly developed and existing cities are constantly undergoing change. Each of these situations presents an opportunity to influence the way in which a community is designed. Public health agencies and professionals, planners, policymakers, and community health advocates have a critical role to play in ensuring that this process leads to the creation of safer and healthier neighborhoods. Land use decisions shape health and safety outcomes and factors, including chronic illness related to food and activity levels, violence and traffic injuries, and exposure to toxins. Improvements to land use policies have the potential to create dramatic, sustainable change to community environments and community health. Described below are the primary mechanisms for influencing local land use decisions.

Strategies

- **Health elements in general plans.**

General plans are “the constitution for [all] future development” within a jurisdiction, to which virtually all land use regulations and approvals must conform.⁹² In other words, with a few limited exceptions, a city may not approve a specific land use regulation or development project unless it is consistent with the city’s adopted general plan. Local governments can include any “voluntary” or additional elements they deem appropriate, and many communities include additional elements that address issues that are important to that community.⁹³ For example, general plans can emphasize the importance of healthy food retail and require mixed-use development or full services, including grocery stores, in all neighborhoods. General plans can also protect farmland, ensure transportation to stores, promote farmers’ markets, and limit fast-food outlets and liquor stores.⁹⁴ Several California cities and counties are beginning to explicitly address health in their general plans, including Anderson, Chula Vista, and Solano County.⁹⁵ Kings County Public Health Department also worked in partnership with the Kings County Community Development Agency to address community health issues in its general plan. Explicit inclusion of health in general plans raises the profile of health as a planning issue and supports long-term inclusion of health in land use decision-making and subsequent efforts to shape zoning codes. Details of the ongoing effort in the City of Richmond to develop and adopt a groundbreaking health element to its general plan are available at <http://www.cityofrichmondgeneralplan.org/news.php?display=1&oid=1000000375>

- **Zoning Codes**

Zoning laws are used to designate specific areas and identify allowable uses within those areas. For example, areas may be zoned for commercial, light industrial, or agricultural uses. Zoning regulations also establish standards for development factors such as lot size, density, open space, distance from roadways, etc. In many jurisdictions, zoning laws must be in alignment with General Plans. Land use and zoning codes can also be used to expand access to healthy

HEALTHY LAND USE

foods. San Francisco, for example, created a special use district to encourage supermarket development when rezoning threatened food retail outlets.⁹⁷ While codes do not usually focus directly on food retail, they often include regulations, such as square footage restrictions, that discourage grocery stores.⁹⁸ Codes can be written to make allowances for retail establishments or to support certain uses, such as food stores.⁹⁹

Zoning laws can be modified through public hearings to achieve other health objectives such as increased park access, restricted access to unhealthy products, and increased walkability. For example, at least eight California communities have permanent zoning ordinances regulating the location of tobacco retailers.¹⁰⁰ The City of Hayward has a zoning ordinance restricting alcohol outlets to at least 500 feet apart and two per block; and cities including Coronado, San Juan Batista, and Arcata have ordinances restricting fast-food restaurants.¹⁰¹ Public Health Law and Policy has put together talking points on Zoning available in English and Spanish (<http://www.phlpnet.org/healthy-planning/products/zoning-talking-points>).

- **Redevelopment funds**

The majority of cities and many counties in California have redevelopment agencies charged with the oversight of urban revitalization efforts. These offices have access to state- and federal- designated funding streams and regulatory and land acquisition tools that can dramatically transform the built environment of an area. The history of redevelopment is controversial as many of the initial redevelopment efforts in the mid-20th century resulted in the drastic razing of entire predominantly low-income, African-American neighborhoods. In response to public outcry, redevelopment powers have been curtailed and public oversight enhanced. Nonetheless, redevelopment efforts must be conducted with sensitivity to existing neighborhood character and recognition of the impacts, particularly health and economic, on current residents.

There is an official process through which a neighborhood becomes designated a “redevelopment area” and thus eligible for redevelopment funds and tools. Every redevelopment area must have a redevelopment plan and must engage citizen oversight through either a Project Area Committee or a Community Advisory Committee. In many cases redevelopment efforts include the revitalization of brownfields.** When redeveloping brownfields, health concerns need to be considered and monitored. Redevelopment funds can be applied to community health priorities and health advocates can use the planning process and ongoing oversight process to ensure that health objectives are addressed in ongoing redevelopment efforts.¹⁰² There are numerous examples of successful redevelopment efforts from across the state – a few have been collected by the Institute for Local Government (<http://www.ca-ilg.org/rdacasestudies>).

- **Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)**

Another economic and community development strategy includes forming an organized group of business or commercial property owners who share common goals about keeping the

** Brownfields are lands previously used for industrial purposes or commercial use, and therefore may be contaminated by the presence of hazardous substances or pollutants.

HEALTHY LAND USE

neighborhood clean, safe, and attractive to shoppers. A Business Improvement District (BID) (also called Community Benefits District) is an organization of property owners in a commercial district who tax themselves to raise money for neighborhood improvement. Core functions usually include keeping sidewalks and curbs clean, removing graffiti, and patrolling the streets. Once a BID is formed, the assessment is mandatory, collected by the city like any other tax. Unlike any other taxes, however, the city returns the assessment to the BID management for use in the district.

BIDs are expected to champion goals that efficiently and effectively improve the neighborhood environment. For example, they can be successful at promoting a healthier environment through a coordinated series of street improvements such as developing public outdoor spaces, improving lighting, installing traffic-calming features and handicap accessibility features, planting trees and other landscaping, and creating pedestrian and bicycle paths. Improvements could also include upgrading storefronts to showcase fresh foods, installing public art, and hiring security that keeps an eye out on the neighborhood. This can improve overall neighborhood safety, encourage safe walking and bicycling, support healthy food retail, improve air quality, and create a respectful environment while showcasing the community's unique character.

The Urban Land Institute has published a how-to resource guide with case studies (<http://www.downtowndevelopment.com/bid.php>). The Los Feliz neighborhood in Los Angeles has an active and successful BID (<http://www.losfelizvillageonline.com/807/>).

- **Mixed-use/mixed-income developments**

Mixed-use developments incorporate housing, shops, schools, workplaces, parks, and civic facilities. Creating neighborhoods with high-density interconnected services, transit, and housing has the potential to improve health by reducing vehicle miles traveled, increasing physical activity, and improving social cohesion. For example, a 12.2% reduction in the odds of becoming obese has been documented when there is an increase in density, mixed-use, and street connectivity within one km (.62 miles) of a residential area. Living in a mixed-use zone with a variety of shops and services is a strong predictor of obesity in urban areas.¹⁰³ Areas with high levels of vehicle miles traveled per capita also tend to have higher accident and injury rates;¹⁰⁴ and a study of 448 counties in the U.S. found that a summary index of urban sprawl predicted the odds of hypertension for county residents (i.e., greater residential density correlated with lower hypertension).¹⁰⁵

As developments are newly built or renovated, strategies addressing gentrification should be implemented to prevent the displacement of current neighborhood residents and to increase affordable housing opportunities in all neighborhoods. The development of mixed-income communities is a critical step toward reducing residential segregation and creating health and social equity. African-American men living in areas with the highest segregation have almost three times the mortality risk as those living in areas of low segregation.¹⁰⁶ Reducing income-related residential segregation has been shown to improve household safety, reduce exposure to crime, and decrease neighborhood social disorder.¹⁰⁷ Inclusionary zoning is a promising

HEALTHY LAND USE

policy strategy that allocates a percentage of the rental or for-sale units in housing developments for low- and moderate-income residents. In return, developers receive cost offsets^{††} as compensation for their affordable housing contribution.¹⁰⁸ Mixed-use and mixed-income developments are complex undertakings requiring extensive planning processes, substantial investment, and diverse partners. For a thorough review of the process involved in developing the Fruitvale Transit Village in Oakland, including strategies for ensuring that health and environmental justice concerns are addressed, see. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/ejustice/case/fruitvale.pdf>

- **Health impact assessment**

Many, if not most policy, funding, and development decisions are made with little if any consideration of health. Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is an emerging discipline that addresses this need. HIA has been described as “a *multidisciplinary process* within which a *range of evidence* about the health effects of a proposal is considered in a *structured framework*...based on a *broad model of health* which proposes that economic, political, social, psychological, and environmental factors determine *population health*.”¹⁰⁹

HIA has the potential to identify activities and policies likely to have significant impacts on health and the ability to reduce the harmful effects and increase the beneficial effects; encourage cross-sectoral collaboration by facilitating discussion of health in decision-making of other sectors such as agriculture, transportation, and economic development; and assess disparate effects on specific racial, ethnic, and economic populations. A number of local public health departments have received training and are building the capacity to perform HIAs that evaluate high-priority issues.

Community advocates and policy makers can use HIA methods to gain insights and quantitative information about the positive and negative impacts on health of a wide range of proposed projects and policies. HIAs can be particularly useful in identifying resource-efficient and health-promoting land use strategies such as mixed-use development and complete streets, and can help focus attention on the design and infrastructure needs for healthy and active living. HIAs can also be a tool for promoting equity through the demonstration of differential impacts of proposed or existing projects and policies on low-income neighborhoods and communities of color. Human Impact Partners has developed a useful HIA toolkit (<http://humanimpact.org/Tools.html>). UCLA’s School of Public Health also provides useful overview and training materials (<http://www.ph.ucla.edu/hs/health-impact/training.htm>).

G. Current Political Opportunities

In spite of the current budget situation in California, there are number of potentially transformative health improvement and community change opportunities. Growing awareness of the importance of improving health by addressing the built environment, as well as awareness of the potential return on investment of community-level chronic disease

^{††} Cost offsets include a range of incentives for developers in exchange for increases in affordable housing. Some examples include streamlining permitting for projects, reducing or deferring permitting fees, and design flexibility (i.e., exemption from certain building codes).

HEALTHY LAND USE

prevention efforts and growing political will to take innovative and far-reaching steps to mitigate and reverse the potential impact of climate change, present multiple opportunities. There are a number of current funding streams that can be applied to built-environment improvements as well as upcoming funding decisions that will have significant impacts on health and safety.

H. Climate change

A. California is taking an aggressive and groundbreaking approach to climate change. State legislation, including AB 32, SB 375, and SB 732, have directed state agencies to lay out ambitious targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and have established mechanisms and processes for achieving the reductions. One of the key strategies under review is community redesign. There are a couple of key opportunities for health advocates to engage in this process.

- **Strategic Growth Council** – The Strategic Growth Council is a cabinet-level committee comprised of the heads of Natural Resources; Environmental Protection; Business, Transportation and Housing; Office of Planning and Research; the Health and Human Service Agency; and one appointed public member. The Council is tasked with coordinating the activities of state agencies to improve air and water quality, protect natural resource and agriculture lands, increase the availability of affordable housing, improve the transportation system, promote public health, assist state and local entities in the planning of sustainable communities, and meeting AB 32 goals. The Council will control funds and establish guidelines and recommendations that will shape development and planning across the state. Advocates can push for strong inclusion of health priorities through public comment and input processes.
- **Regional Blueprint Planning** – The Regional Blueprint Planning Process is coordinated by CalTrans and supports Metropolitan Planning Organizations and rural Regional Transportation Planning Agencies in developing preferred growth scenarios and engaging community participation. The Blueprints will guide planning and transportation and land use decision-making, and inclusion of a health and safety perspective in the process will support regional and local health objectives. The process requires substantive public involvement and review. For more information about the Process, to find the lead agency for your region, and for updates on statewide activity, see <http://calblueprint.dot.ca.gov/>

I. Stimulus Funding

Significant funds have already come into California through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The competitive process for much of the remaining funding will be concluded by the time this guide is published. However, the implementation of community and infrastructure projects present opportunities to advance health objectives and to develop partnerships and cross-disciplinary linkages:

HEALTHY LAND USE

- **Prevention and wellness community funds** – The Communities Putting Prevention to Work initiative includes a \$373 million competitive grant process wherein 30-40 communities nationwide will be funded to implement broad efforts to improve physical activity and nutrition and reduce tobacco consumption. These grants represent an opportunity to build momentum and an evidence base for investment in community-based prevention and to develop new intersectoral partnerships.
- **Infrastructure funds** – Funds allocated to infrastructure projects can support projects that have variable health impacts. For example, transportation funds can support public transit and bikeability or freeway expansion.

J. Other Federal Funding Sources

Local advocates have an important role to play in pushing for federal funding decisions that support local priorities. In particular, the large federal bills and reauthorizations, such as transportation and agriculture, have dramatic effects on the physical environment of communities.

- **Transportation Reauthorization**

The current federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, expired in September 2009, and is currently extended while congress works on a reauthorization. The total transportation budget rivals the Department of Defense and shapes infrastructure in virtually all communities. Organizations are working to ensure that the overall spending in the reauthorization favors non-motorized transit more than previous transportation reauthorization acts. Advocates view current spending patterns as inequitable – not reflecting either the percentage of all trips made by walking or bicycling or the percentage of injuries and fatalities suffered by pedestrians and bicyclists.

Funding in the bill flows largely to state departments of transportation, which become the primary decision-makers and tend to emphasize auto-oriented highway projects in line with their legacy as builders of the interstate system. A much smaller portion of the money is controlled by metropolitan areas, where most people live and most walking occurs. And in sharp contrast to the streamlined, state-driven process to build new streetscape infrastructure, new transit projects must pass high federal government hurdles for cost-efficiency and other measures before getting approval, and funding is so limited that such projects usually receive a much smaller federal match than highway projects.

There are a number of important resources and organizations for getting involved and staying informed about transportation funding, including:

Transportation for America – <http://t4america.org/>

Reconnecting America – <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/>

HEALTHY LAND USE

K. Conclusion

The built environment defines the places people live, work, learn, play, and shop, and in this sense the impact is manifest locally. In every community there are public decision-making processes and regulations that, along with the actions of non-profit and private organizations, determine physical infrastructure; community character; access to recreational, economic, and educational opportunities; and what products are sold and how they are promoted. In order to create substantive changes that prevent chronic illness and injury and improve quality of life, multiple sectors need to be involved and coordinated, and multifaceted strategies need to be employed. This is true whether the objective is closing liquor stores, improving bike infrastructure, or developing joint use agreements.

In addition to local opportunities to reshape the built environment, there are state and federal policies and funding decisions that influence local realities (such as those discussed above in “Political Opportunities”). Regional and statewide organizations and networks have a critical role to play in sharing and leveraging local successes, advocating on a state and federal level, and driving for coordinated action that creates sustainable change. In California there are a number of organizations, networks, and coalitions that are performing these key synthesizing, advocacy, and coordinating functions including:

TransForm (<http://transformca.org/>) – This statewide organization works to create world-class public transportation and walkable communities through building diverse coalitions, influencing policy, and developing innovative programs to improve the lives of all people and protect the environment.

California Convergence (<http://www.californiaconvergence.org/index.php>) links communities across the state that are at the cutting edge of ensuring healthy food and physical activity environments become the norm. California Convergence aims to promote learning, synergy, and collaboration among those community demonstration programs that are innovative leaders in addressing obesity in this state and the nation.

Healthy Places Coalition (<http://preventioninstitute.org/healthyplaces.html>) advances public health involvement in land use and transportation planning to ensure that all neighborhoods in California promote the opportunity to live a healthy life. The Coalition focuses on statewide policy and consists of practitioners from planning, public health, parks and recreation, and other related fields; community advocates and academics; and concerned individuals from around the state committed to social and health equity.

The Strategic Alliance for Healthy Food and Activity Environments

(<http://www.preventioninstitute.org/SA/index.html>) is a coalition of nutrition and physical activity advocates in California. The Alliance is shifting the debate on nutrition and physical activity away from a primary focus on personal responsibility and individual choice to one that examines corporate and government practices and the role of the environment in shaping eating and activity behaviors.

IV. Measures of Progress

Walkable and Bikeable Neighborhoods

- Establish policies that support complete streets and safe routes to schools.
- Local business groups organize to invest in streetscape amenities that enhance safety and walkability and keep the neighborhood clean and attractive to local shoppers.
- More children and families have safe options to bike or walk to school, parks, and neighborhood shopping corridors.
- Traffic-calming measures are employed on neighborhood streets.
- Reduce the number of pedestrian and bicycle injuries and fatalities.
- Residents walk or bike for leisure and for transportation to destinations.

Public Transit

- Public transit options connect community members to employment, commercial, and recreation opportunities.
- Public transit is affordable.
- Transit facilities with disability access are within safe walking distance to households.

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

- Shared and multipurpose facilities (e.g., family resource centers, schools, and parks) are safe and accessible for community use.
- Local parks and playgrounds are safe and offer activities for children, youth, and families.
- Neighborhood parks and/or recreational facilities should be within a safe walking distance (e.g., quarter- or half-mile) to households.
- Parks, open space, and recreation facilities should be equitably distributed throughout all communities.
- Parks, playgrounds, and schools should not have liquor stores and junk food outlets within a quarter-mile.

Safety: Violence and Perceived Violence

- Neighborhood physical infrastructure encourages eyes on the street.
- All communities should have adequate physical infrastructure to support safe walking and biking (e.g., sidewalks, bike lanes, lighting, etc.)
- Graffiti, trash, and other forms of blight are limited.
- Public art is highly visible throughout the community.
- Arts and recreational opportunities are available to youth of all ages after school and on the weekend.
- Communities should enhance personal safety in areas where people are or could be physically active.

HEALTHY LAND USE

Healthful Food Environments

- Incentives are provided to food retailers to locate in and/or offer healthier food and beverage choices in underserved areas.
- Small neighborhood grocery stores carry a wide variety of fresh fruits and vegetables and other healthy and culturally appropriate food items that are fairly priced, and displayed and advertised in a manner that attracts neighborhood customers.
- Local policies encourage square footage of grocery and convenience stores to be dedicated to fresh foods.
- Policies restrict marketing and access to unhealthful foods and beverages, such as alcohol and items containing trans fat.
- Land use policies encourage farmers' markets and produce stands in residential neighborhoods and near community gathering places.
- Neighborhood stores increasingly become WIC vendors; upgrade their offerings in accordance with the new, healthier WIC food packages; and improve the infrastructure of their stores to stock and sell affordable, quality fruits and vegetables.
- Fresh fruits and vegetables from nearby sustainable farms are ubiquitous in school meals and in neighborhood grocery stores.
- Neighborhood residents are increasingly growing their own food in backyards and in community gardens.

Land Use Policy

- Land use planning decisions consider health through tools such as health impact assessments.
- Schools are built and maintained as environmentally healthy buildings and property (e.g., asbestos-safe, lead-free, hazard-free, adequate playgrounds, etc.).
- Schools are built in locations that maximize walking and biking to school and access to physical activity while minimizing exposure to air pollution and other toxins.
- Noise is controlled in indoor and outdoor environments consistent with World Health Organization guidelines for community noise.
- Access to unhealthy products such as tobacco, alcohol, and fast food should be limited through planning mechanisms.

Overarching

- Local government strives to incorporate policies and programs that prioritize the physical well-being of community residents while simultaneously encouraging the economic health of the community.
- Development and investment should be prioritized to create neighborhood conditions that reduce avoidable injury and disease in communities with the greatest need – especially low-income populations and communities of color.
- Mechanisms for community input on built environment planning and decision-making are in place and accessible.

V. Additional Resources

A. Toolkits and Implementation Guides

Walkable and Bikeable Neighborhoods

"Safe Routes to School Guide." National Center for Safe Routes to School (SRTS):
<http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/steps/index.cfm>

"Traffic Calming Toolbox." Project for Public Spaces (PPS):
<http://www.pps.org/info/placemakingtools/casesforplaces/livememtraffic>

Complete Streets Resources

FAQs. National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC):
<http://www.completestreets.org/changing-policy/implementation-faq/>

Policy Elements. National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC):
<http://www.completestreets.org/changing-policy/policy-elements/>

Public Transit

"Building Livable Communities with Transit-Elements of Good Transit-Oriented Development." Local Government Commission (LGC):
http://www.lgc.org/freepub/community_design/articles/build_with_transit/index.html

"Transportation & Health Toolkit 101." Convergence Partnership:
http://www.convergencepartnership.org/site/c.fhLOK6PELmF/b.4950415/k.4FF7/Transportation_and_Health_Toolkit.htm

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Joint Use Agreement development resources templates. Prevention Institute and Berkeley Media Studies Group: www.jointuse.org/resources/make-joint-use-happen/joint-use-templates/

Joint Use Agreement development resources checklist. National Policy & Legal Analysis Network (NPLAN): <http://nplanonline.org/products/checklist-developing-joint-use-agreement-jua>

Safety: Violence and Perceived Violence

"Urban Networks Increasing Thriving Youth (UNITY) Roadmap." Prevention Institute:
<http://preventioninstitute.org/RoadMap.html>

Healthful Food Environments

"Environmental Nutrition and Activity Community Tool (ENACT)." Prevention Institute:
<http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/enact/members/index.php>

"Eight Steps to Get More Fruits and Vegetables into Your Neighborhood." Public Health Law and Policy (PHLP): <http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/healthystores.pdf>

Land Use Policy

Public Health Law and Policy Guides and Tools:

"Economic Development and Redevelopment: A Toolkit on Land Use and Health." Public Health Law and Policy (PHLP): <http://www.phlpnet.org/healthy-planning/products/economic-development-and>

"General Plans and Zoning: A Toolkit on Land Use and Health." Public Health Law and Policy (PHLP): <http://www.phlpnet.org/healthy-planning/products/general-plans-and-zoning>

HEALTHY LAND USE

“How to Create and Implement Healthy General Plans.” Public Health Law and Policy (PHLP): <http://www.phlpnet.org/healthy-planning/products/create-and-implement-hea>

“Zoning: Talking Points.” Public Health Law and Policy (PHLP): http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/PHLP_Zoning.pdf

“Working with Elected Officials to Promote Healthy Land Use Planning and Community Design.” National Association of City and County Health Officials (NACHO): <http://www.naccho.org/topics/environmental/landuseplanning/upload/LUP-Working-with-Officials.pdf>

“HIA Toolkit.” Human Impact Partners: <http://humanimpact.org/Tools.html>

“Healthy Development Measurement Tool.” San Francisco Department of Public Health: <http://www.thehdm.org/>

“Participation Tools for Better Community and Land Use Planning.” Local Government Commission (LGC): http://www.lgc.org/freepub/community_design/participation_tools/index.html

“Transforming Community Development with Land Information Systems.” Lincoln Institute of Land and Policy, 2008: https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/1356_676_Final%20Land%20Info%20PFR%203.08.pdf

Other/Overarching

“The Ahwahnee Principles: Toward More Livable Communities.” Local Government Commission (LGC): http://www.lgc.org/freepub/community_design/articles/ahwahnee_article/index.html

“Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective.” California Air Resources Board and the California Environmental Protection Agency, 2005: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>

“Creating a Regulatory Blueprint for Healthy Community Design.” International City/County Management Association (ICMA), 2005: <http://bookstore.icma.org/freedocs/Active%20Living%20Code%20Reform.pdf>

“HEAC-CCROPP Story Bank.” – These success stories are from communities which are part of the Healthy Eating, Active Communities (HEAC) initiative and the Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program (CCROPP). Community collaboratives can use these stories anywhere where a good, compelling example would help them make their case: <http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3.php>

B. Research or Data Sources to Support Strategies

Walkable and Bikeable Neighborhoods

“The Built Environment: Designing Communities to Promote Physical Activity in Children.” *Pediatrics*, June 2009: <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/content/full/123/6/1591>

“Complete Streets Lower Transportation Costs.” National Complete Streets Coalition: <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/factsheets/cs-individuals.pdf>

Public Transit

“The Transportation Prescription: Bold New Ideas for Transportation Reform in America.” Prevention Institute, PolicyLink, and Convergence Partnership: http://www.preventioninstitute.org/documents/transportationRX_final.pdf

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

“The Health Benefits of Parks.” Trust for Public Land, 2006: http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=21053&folder_id=188

HEALTHY LAND USE

“Promising Strategies for Creating Healthy Eating and Active Living Environments.” prepared by Prevention Institute for the Convergence Partnership, 2008: http://www.convergencepartnership.org/atf/cf/%7B245A9B44-6DED-4ABD-A392-AE583809E350%7D/CP_Promising%20Strategies_printed.pdf

Safety: Violence and Perceived Violence

“Cost Benefit Analysis” (of Los Angeles’ Gang Prevention Efforts). Vera Institute of Justice: http://www.advancementprojectca.org/doc/p3_cost.pdf

Healthful Food Environments

“Designed For Disease: The Link Between Local Food Environments and Obesity and Diabetes.” California Center for Public Health Advocacy, PolicyLink, and the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2008. <http://www.publichealthadvocacy.org/designedfordisease.html>

“Cultivating Common Ground: Linking Health and Sustainable Agriculture.” Prevention Institute, 2004: http://www.preventioninstitute.org/pdf/Cultivating_Common_Ground_112204.pdf

“Neighborhood Characteristics Associated With the Location of Food Stores and Food Service Places,” Morland, K. et al. *American Journal of Preventive Health*. 22, No. 1, 2002: 23–29.

Land Use Policy

“Measuring the Health Effects of Sprawl.” Smart Growth America, Surface Transportation Policy Project, 2003: <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/report/HealthSprawl8.03.pdf>

“Planning Communities: What Health Has to Do With It.” Contra Costa Health Services, 2007: http://cchealth.org/groups/injury_prevention/pdf/planning_healthy_communities.pdf

Other/Overarching

“Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program (CCROPP) Phase I Evaluation Findings 2006-2008.” Samuels and Associates: http://samuelsandassociates.com/samuels/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=27&Itemid=11

“Healthy Eating Active Communities (HEAC) Phase I Evaluation Findings, 2005-2008 –Final Report.” Samuels and Associates: http://samuelsandassociates.com/samuels/upload/ourlatest/HEAC_Phase1_Evaluation_ExecutiveSum.pdf

“The Synthesis Project. The Built Environment and Physical Activity: What is the Relationship?” Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2007: Retrieved from http://www.rwjf.org/pr/synthesis/reports_and_briefs/pdf/no11_policybrief.pdf.

“Health Effects of Gentrification.” Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC): <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/healthtopics/gentrification.htm>

Frank, Lawrence D. “Public Health and the Built Environment: Emerging Evidence and Complexity.” 2004: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1P3-650962301.html>

“What Surrounds Us Shapes Us: Making the Case for Environmental Change.” Berkeley Media Studies Group, 2009: http://www.bmsg.org/pdfs/Talking_Upstream.pdf

“Understanding the Relationship Between Public Health and the Built Environment.” LEED-ND Core Committee, 2006: http://www.activeliving.org/files/LEED_ND_report.pdf

“Paying with Our Health: The Real Cost of Freight Transportation in California.” Pacific Institute, 2006: http://www.pacinst.org/reports/freight_transport/PayingWithOurHealth_Web.pdf

Endnotes

- 1 "Does the Built Environment Influence Physical Activity? Examining the Evidence." TRB Special Report 282. Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, March-April 2005. Available at http://www.trb.org/news/blurb_detail.asp?id=4536. Accessed December 2007.
- 2 Resolution 713-09, Passed by California Medical Association House of Delegates, October 2009.
- 3 Tester, JM. "The Built Environment: Designing Communities To Promote Physical Activity In Children." Committee on Environmental Health. *Pediatrics*, 123, No. 6, June 2009: 1591-1598.
- 4 Alaniz, M. "Alcohol Availability and Targeted Advertising in Racial/Ethnic Minority Communities," *Alcohol Health and Research World*, 22, 1998.
- 5 Sharp, R. & Walker, B. "The Clean Air Color Line: Why Non-Anglo Californians Will Benefit From New State Particulate Standards." Environmental Working Group, June 2002. Accessed at http://www.ewg.org/files/particlecivics2_report.pdf
- 6 "Parks for People - Los Angeles: The Case for Support." The Trust for Public Land, 2004.
- 7 Green, R.S. et al. "Proximity of California Public Schools to Busy Roads." *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 112, No. 1, January 2004: 61-66.
- 8 CensusScope Segregation Rankings. Available at <http://www.censuscope.org/segregation.html>
- 9 Poverty and Race Research Action Council Analysis of U.S. Census Bureau Data. Assisted by Denton, Nancy A. and Anderson, Bridget J., 2005.
- 10 Smedley, B. et al. "Race, Racial Inequity and Health Inequities: Separating Myth from Fact." 2008. Available at http://www.unnaturalcauses.org/assets/uploads/file/Race_Racial_Inequality_Health.pdf
- 11 Seitles, M. "The Perpetuation of Residential Racial Segregation in America: Historical Discrimination, Modern Forms of Exclusion, and Inclusionary Remedies." *Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law*, 1996.
- 12 "Health Effects of Gentrification." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/healthtopics/gentrification.htm>
- 13 Dellinger, A.M. et al. "Barriers to Children Walking and Biking to School—United States, 1999." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 51, No. 32, August 2002: 701-704.
- 14 City of Toronto Bike Plan, 2001. Accessed at <http://www.toronto.ca/cycling/bikeplan/pdf/chapter05.pdf>
- 15 Brian, Richard. "Mean Streets, Pedestrian Safety and Reform of the Nation's Transportation Law." The Environmental Working Group, April 1997.
- 16 "A New Public Health Paradigm: Promoting Health Through Community Design." Active Living By Design. Retrieved from <http://www.activelivingbydesign.org/index.php?id=16>
- 17 Saelens, B.E. et al. "Neighborhood-Based Differences in Physical Activity: An Environment Scale Evaluation." *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, No. 9, September 2003: 1552-1558.
- 18 Brennan Ramirez, L.K. et al. "Indicators of Activity-Friendly Communities: An Evidence-Based Consensus Process." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 31, No. 6, December 2006: 515-524.
- 19 "The Built Environment and Physical Activity: What is the Relationship?" Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The Synthesis Project, Issue 11, April 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.rwjf.org/pr/product.jsp?id=20112>
- 20 Brennan Ramirez, L.K. et al. "Indicators of Activity-Friendly Communities: An Evidence-Based Consensus Process." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 31, No. 6, December 2006: 515-524.
- 21 Koepfel, D. "Invisible Riders." *Bicycling Magazine*, July 2006.
- 22 Williams J. et al. "Promoting Bicycle Commuting: Understanding the Customer." *Transportation Quarterly*, 50, 1996: 67-68.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Campbell, B.J. et al. "A Review of Pedestrian Safety Research in the United States and Abroad." Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, April 2004. Available at http://www.trb.org/news/blurb_detail.asp?id=3260. Accessed December 2007.

HEALTHY LAND USE

- 25 Shinkle, D. "Complete Streets." The National Conference of State Legislatures, 2007. Available for purchase at <http://ecom.ncsl.org/bookstore/productDetail.htm?prodid=0190001547&catsel=xtrn%3BTransportation>. Accessed December 2007.
- 26 "Complete Streets Laws and Ordinances." Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC). Available at <http://www.walkinginfo.org/library/details.cfm?id=3968>. Accessed December 2007.
- 27 "Portland's Green Dividend." CEOs for Cities, July 2007. Accessed October 2009 at http://www.ceosforcities.org/files/PGD_FINAL.pdf
- 28 Staunton, Catherine E. et al. "Promoting Safe Walking and Biking to School: The Marin County Success Story." *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, No. 9, September 2003: 1431-1434. <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/cgi/content/abstract/93/9/1431>
- 29 "The Built Environment and Health: 11 Profiles of Neighborhood Transformation." Prevention Institute. Available at <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/builtenv.html>. Accessed December 2007.
- 30 "Obesity Prevention Council 'Madera In Motion' Sees Safe Neighborhoods as Key to Community Health." Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program. Accessed at http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_10.php
- 31 "Inclusive Pedestrian Environments: Resources and Recommendations." Adaptive Environments. Available at http://adaptiveenvironments.org/pedestrian/files/report_hypotheses.html. Accessed December 2007.
- 32 Anderson, S. "The School That Wasn't." *The Nation*, May 2000. Available at <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20000605/anderson>
- 33 Besser, L.M. et al. "Walking to Public Transit: Steps to Help Meet Physical Activity Recommendations." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 29, No. 4, 2005: 273-280. Available at http://www.cdc.gov/HEALTHYPLACES/publications/besser_dannenberg.pdf
- 34 "TCRP Synthesis 62: Integration of Bicycles and Transit." Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, October 2009. Retrieved from http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_syn_62.pdf
- 35 Frumkin, H. "Health, Equity, and the Built Environment." *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 113, No. 5, May 2005: A290-A291.
- 36 "Transportation and Social Equity." Surface Transportation Policy Project. Retrieved from <http://www.transact.org/library/factsheets/equity.asp>
- 37 "Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study: Factors for Success in California." California Department of Transportation, May 2002.
- 38 Ho, C. "Parks, Research Update: Recreation and Public Health." Parks & Recreation, April 2003. Available at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1145/is_4_38/ai_100960607/
- 39 "Physical (In)Activity Among Low-Income Children and Youth: Problem, Prospect, Challenge." Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.theafterschoolproject.org/uploads/Physical-inActivity-Report.pdf>
- 40 Gies, E. "The Health Benefits of Parks." The Trust for Public Land, 2006. Available at http://www.tpl.org/tier2_cl.cfm?folder_id=725
- 41 "Promoting Physical Activity." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Community Guide Task Force on Community Preventive Services. Available through <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/pahand.htm>
- 42 Gies, E. "The Health Benefits of Parks." The Trust for Public Land, 2006. Available at http://www.tpl.org/tier2_cl.cfm?folder_id=725
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 "Healthy Parks, Healthy Communities: Addressing Health Disparities and Park Inequities through Public Financing of Parks, Playgrounds, and Other Physical Activity Settings." The Trust for Public Land, October 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.lchc.org/documents/HealthyParksHealthyCommunities.pdf>
- 45 "Active Living and Social Equity: Creating Healthy Communities for All Residents." International City/County Management Association, January 2005. Retrieved from <http://icma.org/upload/library/2005-02/%7B16566E96-721D-467D-9521-3694F918E5CE%7D.pdf>
- 46 Giles-Corti, B. et al. "Relative Influences of Individual, Social Environmental, and Physical Environmental Correlates of Walking." *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, No. 9, September 2003: 1583-1589.

HEALTHY LAND USE

- 47 Brownson, R.C. et al. "Environmental and Policy Determinants of Physical Activity in the United States." *American Journal of Public Health*, 91, No. 12, December 2001: 1995-2003. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11726382>
- 48 Cooper, T. & Vincent, J. "Joint Use School Partnerships in California: Strategies to Enhance Schools and Communities." Center for Cities and Schools and Public Health Law and Policy, August 2008. Accessed at http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/reports/CC&S_PHLP_2008_joint_use_with_appendices.pdf
- 49 Lynch, M. "Consequences of Children's Exposure to Community Violence." *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, December 2003, 6, No. 4: 265-74. Available at <http://www.springerlink.com/content/m43733743g860069/>
- 50 Golden, M. & Siegel, J. "Cost Benefit Analysis of LA's Gang Prevention Efforts." Vera Institute of Justice. Available at http://www.advancementprojectca.org/doc/p3_cost.pdf. Accessed October 2009.
- 51 Powell, L.M. et al. "The Relationship Between Community Physical Activity Settings and Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status." *Evidence-Based Preventive Medicine*, 1, No. 2, March 2004: 135-144. Available through <http://www.rwjf.org/pr/product.jsp?id=14654>
- 52 Jacobs, J. "The Death and Life of Great American Cities." Random House and Vintage Books, 1961.
- 53 Newman, O. "Creating Defensible Space." U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, April 1996. Available at <http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdf/def.pdf>
- 54 "Community Programs to Promote Youth Development: Executive Summary." National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. National Academies Press, 2002.
- 55 Roman, C.G. et al. "Alcohol Outlets as Attractors of Violence and Disorder: A Closer Look at the Neighborhood Environment." Urban Institute, April 2008. Accessed at <http://www.urban.org/publications/411663.html>
- 56 Scribner, R.A. et al. "The Risk of Assaultive Violence and Alcohol Availability in Los Angeles County." *American Journal of Public Health*, 84, No.3, 1995. Available at <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/cgi/content/abstract/85/3/335>
- 57 Campbell, C.A. et al. "The Effectiveness of Limiting Alcohol Outlet Density As A Means of Reducing Excessive Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol-Related Harms." Task Force on Community Preventive Services. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 37, No. 6, December 2009: 556-569.
- 58 Lewis, R.K. et al. "Evaluating The Effects of Community Coalition's Efforts to Reduce Illegal Sales of Alcohol and Tobacco Products to Minors." *Journal of Community Health*, December 1996, 21, No. 6: 429-436.
- 59 Gershon, R. "Public Transportation: Advantages and Challenges." *Journal of Urban Health*, 82, No. 1, March 2005.
- 60 Morland, K. et al. "Neighborhood Characteristics Associated with the Location of Food Stores and Food Service Places." *American Journal of Preventive Health*, 22, No. 1, January 2002: 23-29. Available at http://minorityhealth.pitt.edu/archive/00000412/01/Neighborhood_Characteristics_Associated_with_the_Location_of_Food_Stores_and_Food_Service_Places.pdf; and Powell, L. M. et al., "Food Store Availability and Neighborhood Characteristics in the United States." *Preventive Medicine*, 44, No. 3, March 2007: 189-195. Available at http://www.healthydurham.org/docs/file/committees/obesity_chronic_care/Grocstore.pdf
- 61 Wright, J. D. et al. "Trends in Intake of Energy and Macronutrients: United States, 1971-2000." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 53, No.4, February 2004: 80-82. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5304a3.htm>
- 62 Babey, S.H. et al. "Designed for Disease: The Link Between Local Food Environments and Obesity and Diabetes." California Center for Public Health Advocacy, PolicyLink, and the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, April 2008.
- 63 Brownell, K. and Horgen, K. "Food Fight: The Inside Story of the Food Industry, America's Obesity Crisis, and What We Can Do About It." McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- 64 Morland, K. et al. "Neighborhood Characteristics Associated with the Location of Food Stores and Food Service Places." *American Journal of Preventive Health*, 22, No. 1, January 2002: 23-29. Available at http://minorityhealth.pitt.edu/archive/00000412/01/Neighborhood_Characteristics_Associated_with_the_Location_of_Food_Stores_and_Food_Service_Places.pdf; and Powell, L. M. et al., "Food Store Availability and Neighborhood Characteristics in the United States." *Preventive Medicine*, 44, No. 3, March 2007: 189-195. Available at http://www.healthydurham.org/docs/file/committees/obesity_chronic_care/Grocstore.pdf
- 65 Babey, S.H. et al. "Designed for Disease: The Link Between Local Food Environments and Obesity and Diabetes." California Center for Public Health Advocacy, PolicyLink, and the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, April 2008.

HEALTHY LAND USE

- 66 "Cultivating Common Ground: Linking Health and Sustainable Agriculture." Prevention Institute, September 2004. Available at http://www.preventioninstitute.org/pdf/Cultivating_Common_Ground_112204.pdf. Accessed May 2008.
- 67 "2008 Restaurant Industry Pocket Factbook." National Restaurant Association. Retrieved July 2008 from http://www.restaurant.org/pdfs/research/2008forecast_factbook.pdf
- 68 Gunderson, P. et al. "The Epidemiology of Suicide Among Farm Residents or Workers in Five North-Central States, 1980-1988." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 9, No. 3, May-June 1993: 26-32.
- 69 Solomon, G. M. and Motts, L. "Trouble on the Farm: Growing Up with Pesticides in Agricultural Communities." National Resources Defense Council, October 1998. Available at <http://www.nrdc.org/health/kids/farm/farminx.asp>. Accessed July 2008.
- 70 Harvie, J. et al. "A New Healthcare Prevention Agenda: Sustainable Food Procurement and Agricultural Policy." *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition*, 4, No. 3-4, July 2009. Special issue on "Food Systems and Public Health: Linkages to Achieve Healthier Diets and Healthier Communities." Available at <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~db=all~content=t792306860>
- 71 ENACT Local Policy Database. Prevention Institute, July 2008. Accessed at <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/> and <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdftext/LAFastfoodBan.pdf>
- 72 Valley Vision. Accessed at <http://www.valleyvision.org/index.html>
- 73 "A Vision for California's Healthy Purchase Pilot." California Food Policy Advocates. Available at <http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/HPPAdvocacyToolkit/HPPVisionv2.pdf>
- 74 H.R. 2419, 110th Congress, The Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008, (enacted).
- 75 H.R. 2419, 110th Congress, The Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008, Title IV-Nutrition, (enacted).
- 76 Conrey, E.J. et al. "Integrated Program Enhancements Increased Utilization of Farmers' Market Nutrition Program." *The Journal of Nutrition*, 133, June 2003: 1841-1844. Available at <http://jn.nutrition.org/cgi/content/abstract/133/6/1841>
- 77 Pacific Grove, (California) Municipal Code Title 23 § 23.32.020, 2006. Retrieved June 2008 from http://nt2.scbbs.com/cgi-bin/om_isapi.dll?clientID=186693543&infobase=procode-4&softpage=Browse_Frame_Pg
- 78 "Community Health and Food Access: The Local Government Role." International City/County Management Association, August 2006. Retrieved September 2007 from <http://www.icma.org/upload/library/2006-09/%7B5CD4101C-2803-4655-9A51-465461B3C897%7D.pdf>
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 "Mobile Farmers Market Delivers Fresh Produce and a Side of Nutrition Education to Low-Income Communities in San Joaquin County." Central California Regional Obesity Prevention and Healthy Eating, Active Communities. Accessed at http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_15.php
- 81 "Changing the Food Environment: Adding EBT Turns Flea Markets into Convenient and Affordable Farmers Markets." Central California Regional Obesity Prevention and Healthy Eating, Active Communities.. Accessed at http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_20.php
- 82 Ceres Farmer's Market Flyer. Ceres Partnership for Healthy Children. Accessed at http://www.csufresno.edu/ccchhs/institutes_programs/CCROPP/activities/ceresFM.pdf
- 83 "School Farm Stand Opens June 4." - Press release. Fresno Metro Ministry. Accessed at <http://www.fresno.gov/NR/rdonlyres/2BFCE28B-6309-41BC-B3B40C3A07C7F153/14006/SchoolFarmStandsAddamsandCarver.pdf>
- 84 "Oakland Farm to School: Oakland Schools Become Neighborhood Produce Markets, Expanding Residents' Access to Healthy, Affordable Food." Healthy Eating, Active Communities. Accessed at http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_13.php
- 85 "Pixley's School-Based Food Access: A Popular School Produce Stand Improves Community Nutrition and Health, and A Step-By-Step Handbook Shows How." Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program. Accessed at http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_22.php
- 86 "ENACT Local Policy Database." Strategic Alliance and Prevention Institute. Accessed at http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/policy_detail.php?s_Search=fresno&policyID=276

HEALTHY LAND USE

- 87 Hamilton, N. "Farmers Market Policy: An Inventory of Federal, State, and Local Examples." October 2005. Retrieved September 2007 from <http://www.pps.org/pdf/FarmersMarketPolicyPaperFINAL.pdf>
- 88 Henchy, G. "New Healthy WIC Food Packages Farmers' Markets Can Play a Key Role in Providing Fruits and Vegetables." March 2008. Retrieved July 2008 from http://www.frac.org/WIC/pdf/newfood/WIC_newfood_farmarket.pdf
- 89 "'Local' Food Initiatives in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008." Farm and Food Project. Retrieved June 2008 from http://www.farmandfoodproject.org/documents/uploads/Local_Foods_in_the_2008_Farm_Bill_5-23-08.pdf
- 90 North American Food Policy Council's Webpage. Community Food Security Coalition. Accessed July 2008 from <http://www.foodsecurity.org/FPC/>
- 91 Ibid.
- 92 "How to Create and Implement Healthy General Plans: A Toolkit For Building Healthy, Vibrant Communities Through Land Use Policy Change." Public Health Law and Policy and Raimi & Associates, 2008. Available at http://www.calendow.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/By_Topic/Disparities/General/HealthyGP_Toolkit.pdf
- 93 Ibid.
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 "Healthy Planning Policies: A Compendium from California General Plans." Public Health Law & Policy, 2009. Available at http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/Healthy_Planning_Policies_Compendium_FINAL_web_090925.pdf
- 96 "Applying Smart Growth Principles to General Plan Update, Kings County Moves Toward a Healthier Future." Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program. Retrieved January 2010 from http://www.healthyeatingactivecommunities.org/communications3_9.php
- 97 San Francisco, California, Planning Code 7 § 781.10 - 17th and Rhode Island Street Grocery Store Special Use Subdistrict, 2006. Retrieved June 2008 from <http://www.municode.com/content/4201/14139/HTML/ch007.html>
- 98 Ashe, M. et al. "Local Venues For Change: Legal Strategies For Healthy Environments." *Journal of Law, Medicine, & Ethics*, 35, No.1, March 2007: 138-147.
- 99 "Healthy Planning Policies: A Compendium from California General Plans." Public Health Law and Policy, 2009. Available at http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/Healthy_Planning_Policies_Compendium_FINAL_web_090925.pdf
- 100 "List of California Communities with Land Use/Zoning Ordinances Regulating the Location of Tobacco Retailers." Public Health Law and Policy, March 2004. Accessed at http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/B_ListOfCommunitiesWithLandUse_ZoningOrdinance_3_04.pdf
- 101 ENACT Local Policy Database. Strategic Alliance and Prevention Institute. Accessed at <http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/index.php>
- 102 "How to Use Redevelopment to Create Healthier Communities." Public Health Law and Policy. Available at http://www.phlpnet.org/sites/phlpnet.org/files/PHLP_Redev_factsheet.pdf
- 103 Frank, L.D. et al. "Obesity Relationships with Community Design, Physical Activity, and Time Spent in Cars." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 27, No.2, August 2004: 87-96.
- 104 Ewing, R. et al. "Urban Sprawl As a Risk Factor in Motor Vehicle Occupant and Pedestrian Fatalities." *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, No. 9, September 2003: 1541-1545. Available at <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/cgi/content/abstract/93/9/1541>
- 105 Ewing, R. et al. "Relationship Between Urban Sprawl and Physical Activity, Obesity, and Morbidity." *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 18, No. 1, September 2003: 47-57.
- 106 Jackson, S.A. and Anderson, R.T. "The Relation of Residential Segregation to All-Cause Mortality: A Study in Black and White." *American Journal of Public Health*, 90, No. 4, April 2000: 615-617.
- 107 Anderson, L.M. et al. "Providing Affordable Family Housing and Reducing Residential Segregation By Income: A Systematic Review." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 24, No. 3S, April 2003: 47-67.
- 108 "Health Effects of Gentrification." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/healthypplaces/healthtopics/gentrification.htm>. Accessed December 2007.
- 109 Northern & York Public Health Observatory, 2001