IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS TABLE 44

Traffic Safety

EFFECTIVENESS TABLES

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
United States				
Author Joshu, Boehmer (2008) and Brownson, Baker (2001) USA **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (metropolitan counties' gross population density, percentage of county population living in suburban and urban densities, net density, block size, percentage of blocks with less than 1/100 square miles, perceived barriers to physical activity including hills, lack of sidewalk, sprawl index) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (body mass index) and physical activity (surveys)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: 1) Perceptions of barriers and heavy traffic are associated with increased odds of being obese 2) Access to facilities, positive neighborhood characteristics, policies supporting physical activity and other perceptions are associated with increased levels of physical activity)** **Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Heavy traffic was associated with obesity within large metropolitan (adjusted OR= 1.9, 95% CI: 1.3-2.9), micropolitan (adjusted OR= 2.2, 95% CI: 1.03-4.5) and rural areas (adjusted OR= 1.7, 95% CI: 0.8-3.3. 2. An increase in the number of perceived neighborhood barriers increased the odds of being obese (chi-square for linear trend, $p<0.05$ PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 3. Neighborhood characteristics, including heavy traffic (OR=1.28, 95% CI=1.04, 1.58), were positively associated with physical activity. (Note: Neighborhood barriers were assed with a composite score including absence of sidewalks, absence of trails, absence of aesthetic quality, absence of hills, presence of heavy traffic, presence of pollution, and presence of unattended dogs.)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/obesity in the study population and negative association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author McGinn, Evenson (2007) Mississippi and North Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (neighborhood perceptions of connectivity, and walkability [high-speed traffic, heavy traffic, lack of cross walks, lack of sidewalks]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity, including meeting recommendations for leisure activity, outdoor leisure activity, and transportation activity (Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS], perceived environment survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: High traffic speeds, increased traffic volume, and increased crashes involving pedestrians will lead to decreased physical activity. Increased street connectivity will lead to increased activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Both Sites* 1. Perceptions that high-speed traffic, heavy traffic, and lack of sidewalks were a problem in an individual's neighborhood were not associated with any of the physical activity outcomes. Forsyth County, NC 2. Individuals in areas with low-traffic speed were more likely to meet recommendations for leisure activity than to be inactive for all three buffer sizes, compared to those living in areas of high-traffic speed (One-Mile; OR=1.7, 95%CI=1.0-2.7, $p<0.05$, Half-Mile; OR=1.6, 95%CI=1.0-2.6, $p<0.05$, Eighth-Mile; OR=2.1, 95%CI=1.3-3.4, $p<0.05$). 3. When examining the eighth mile buffer, individuals in areas with low-traffic volume were more likely to be insufficiently active during leisure physical activity and outdoor leisure activity than to be inactive and engage in any transportation activity (OR=1.6, 95%CI=1.0-2.3, $p<0.05$, OR=1.4, 95%CI=1.0-2.0, $p<0.05$, and OR=1.4, 95%CI=1.0-2.1, $p<0.05$, respectively). 4. Individuals within the one-mile buffer, in areas where there was a low occurrence of crashes were more likely to meet recommendations for leisure physical activity for the one mile and half mile neighborhoods (OR=1.9, 95%CI 1.0-3.4, $p<0.05$). Jackson County, MS 5. Those whose one-mile neighborhoods had low-traffic volumes were more likely to not meet recommendations and be insufficiently active than inactive during leisure activity, outdoor leisure activity, or walking for any purpose, with significant associations for being insufficiently active compared to inactive during leisure activity and walking for any purpose (OR=0.5, 95%CI=0.3-1.1 and OR=0.5, 95%CI=0.3-1.0, $p<0.05$, respectively). 6. Individuals within the one and half mile buffers, in areas with low occurrence of crashes were less likely to engage in any transportation activity compared with those who live in areas with a high occurrence of crashes (OR=0.6; 95%CI 0.4, 1.0; $p<0.05$ and OR=0.6; 95%CI 0.4, 0.9; $p<0.05$, respectively).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported A disproportionate sampling strategy was adopted for the NC sample frame to ensure representation for areas outside of the Winston-Salem.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Boehmer, Lovegreen (2006) Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (presence of quality sidewalks and shoulders, perceived recreational facilities, land use, barriers related to traffic safety and crime, aesthetics) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (body mass index [BMI] self-report of height and weight)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Access to facilities and positive perceptions of neighborhood safety [crime and traffic] and pleasantness will lead to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: *Stratified Analysis:* 1. Feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=2.46, 95%CI= 1.63-3.71, p<0.05) was associated with being obese/inactive. 2. Feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=1.65, 95%CI=1.2-2.27, p<0.05) was associated with being obese.	**Positive Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/ obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High The communities in TN and AR were selected to match the MO sites on size, race/ ethnicity, and proportion of the population living below the poverty level. 8 communities met the US Census definition of rural; 12 were located within a nonmetropolitan county.
Author Lee, Vernez-Moudon (2006) Washington **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (land-use, street vegetation, block size, perceptions of type of neighborhood, architecture, awareness of neighbors, traffic problems, air pollution) **Outcome(s) Affected** Recreation and transportation walking (survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: Increased diversity in land-use and better access to public transit and decreased traffic volume will lead to increased active transportation.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Objective Correlates of Walking* 1. Route related variables, such as block size, traffic volume, sidewalk, and street trees, did not show a statistically significant association with transportation walking.	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Catlin, Simoes (2003) Missouri **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (indoor, and outdoor, trails, and parks, perceived criminal safety, traffic safety, pleasantness of neighborhood) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (Missouri Cardiovascular Disease Survey - self-reported weight and height [body mass index])	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Community and worksite infrastructure that promotes physical activity and the perception that the community is safe and pleasing will lead to increased levels of physical activity, which leads to decreased levels of overweight/obesity.)** **Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Individuals who perceived their neighborhood or community to have 1, 2, or 3 negative characteristics were 14% (95%CI: 0.93-1.4), 23% (95%CI: 0.91-1.66), and 56% (95%CI: 3.06-2.28) more likely to be overweight, respectively, than individuals who perceived their neighborhood to be safe and pleasant. 2. Employed persons with 1 or 2 negative community perceptions were 1.45 times more likely to be overweight (95%CI: 1.07-1.96 and 95%CI: 0.92-2.26, respectively). Those with 3 negative perceptions were 2.83 times more likely to be overweight (95%CI: 1.53-5.24). (Note: A four level composite variable was computed for perceived community factors, with zero representing an environment that is crime safe, traffic safe, and pleasant.)	**Positive Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/ obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported Employed participants differed from the total sample in that there was a higher prevalence of men, younger age groups, post-high school education, and current smokers. A disproportionate stratified sampling design was used to randomly select households in the state of Missouri. Minority and low-income zip codes in urban centers were oversampled.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Zhu, Lee (2009) Texas **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (parents perception of safe neighborhoods, safety from traffic, and sidewalks) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (3-Page Questionnaire [PedsQL])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: Positive parental perceptions of the school route (condition of sidewalks, bus stops, route safe from traffic) and decreased school provisioning for school buses leads to increased active commuting.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Parents' safety concerns (range: -2.8 to 2.0) and the need to cross highways or freeways were negative correlates to children's walking behaviors (coefficient= -0.253, OR=0.776, 95% CI= 0.695-0.867, p<0.001; coefficient= -0.485, OR=0.616, 95% CI= 0.422-0.898, p<0.05, respectively).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Grow, Saelens (2008) Massachusetts, Ohio, California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (street connectivity and land-use mix) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity and active transportation (survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Increased access to places to be active, greater land-use mix and street connectivity and pedestrian infrastructure, and the perception of being safe from traffic and crime leads to increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Adolescents who usually walked/biked to at least 5 sites (site median) had higher scores on perceived pedestrian infrastructure and on traffic safety both by parent report and self-report and had higher land use mix and street connectivity for adolescent report only (no statistics). 2. Parents and adolescents who usually walked/biked to at least 5 sites reported higher perceptions for pedestrian infrastructure and traffic safety (no statistics). 3. On the basis of adolescent and parent report multivariate regression models revealed that positive estimates were found for street connectivity, pedestrian infrastructure, and traffic safety and a negative estimate was found for crime threat in relation to the number of sites to which adolescents walked/biked. After adding proximity to the model, only traffic safety remained highly significantly associated with usual walking/biking to sites for both parent (β=0.55, p<0.01) and adolescent (β=0.3, p<0.01) reports.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Kerr, Rosenberg (2006) Washington **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, proximity and ease of access to nonresidential land uses, street connectivity, walking or cycling facilities, aesthetics, pedestrian traffic safety, and crime safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Active commuting (survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Increased parental perceptions of neighborhood walkability, including safety from traffic and crime, land-use mix, and neighborhood aesthetics, will lead to more active commuting.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Parent concerns were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR= 5.2, 95%CI 2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 2. A parental concerns scale was most strongly associated with child active commuting (OR=5.2, 95% CI= 2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 3. Parent concerns were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR=4.9, 95% CI=2.54-9.40, p<0.05). (Note: Parental concerns were based on a scale that included both interpersonal and traffic fears.)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author King, Toobert (2006) California, Oregon, Georgia, Rhode Island, Tennessee **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, land use mix, access to restaurants and retail stores, street connectivity, walking and cycling facilities, aesthetics) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate-intensity and vigorous physical activity, leisure walking, walking for errands (Community Health Activities Model Program for Seniors [CHAMPS] questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Perceiving the neighborhood as safe from traffic and crime and living in walkable neighborhoods [e.g., land-use mix and street connectivity] will lead to increased levels of physical activity)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In Stanford, participants who strongly agreed with "most drivers exceed the posted speed limits while driving in the neighborhood" showed fewer minutes per week of 6-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by approximately 90 minutes or more per week) relative to intervention participants reporting speeding drivers to be less of an issue this interaction effect reached significance (F for interaction term= 3.8, [1,89], p=0.05). 2. In Oregon, participants who strongly agreed that their neighborhood was generally safe showed more minutes per week of 24-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by approximately 150 minutes or more per week) relative to intervention participants reporting their neighborhoods as being less safe. 3. In Oregon, the interaction term involving the item that states "the crosswalks in my neighborhood help walkers feel safe crossing busy streets" reached significance [F for interaction term=5.2(1,1170, p=0.02)]. Participants who strongly agreed with this item showed more minutes per week of 24-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by approximately 100 minutes/week) relative to intervention participants endorsing lower levels of this item. 4. In Oregon, the neighborhood traffic and crime-related safety subscale reached statistical significance (F for interaction term= 5.9[1,117], p=0.016). Participants who strongly agreed that "my neighborhood is safe enough that I would let a 10-year old boy walk around my block alone in the daytime" showed more minutes per week of 24-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by approximately 150 minutes per week) relative to intervention participants reporting lower levels of this item. 5. In Atlanta, the interaction involving a variable of perceived neighborhood safety-the presence of crosswalks in the neighborhood that helped walkers feel safe crossing busy streets-reached statistical significance (F for interaction term=3.1(2,197), p=0.048). 6. In Atlanta, participants randomized to the physical activity intervention involving tailored messages plus telephone follow-up who strongly agreed that "the crosswalks in my neighborhood help walkers feel safe crossing busy streets" showed more minutes per week of 12-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by more than 100 minutes/week) relative to intervention participants reporting lower values on this item.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Weir, Etelson (2006) New York **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (safety from traffic and crime) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (parent survey assessed child's physical activity and extent of outside play)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals living in an inner-city environment have increased problems with safety, which leads to decreased physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In the inner city population, children's physical activity levels were negatively correlated with parental anxiety about neighborhood safety (r= -0.18, p<0.05, n=188). No correlation was found for suburban children (p=0.35, n=97). (Note: Safety was a composite score of interpersonal and traffic safety indicators.)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Troped, Saunders (2001) Massachusetts **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Walkability and bikability* (land-use, perceived steep hill and busy street barriers, distance to bikeway, and street network including sidewalks) **Outcome(s) Affected** Bikeway use (Arlington Physical Activity and Bikeway Survey)	**Not Reported (for desired health outcome)** **Positive Association for Bikeway Use in the Study Population** **(Assumption: Closer proximity to the Bikeway and decreased barriers, such as crossing a busy street or inconvenient distance, between residence and the Bikeway leads to increased use.)** **Safety-Traffic** BIKEWAY USE: 1. Based on survey data, respondents who reported that they did not have to cross a busy street to access the Bikeway were about 2 times more likely to be Bikeway users than those who reported this barrier (OR=2.01, 95%CI= 1.11-3.63). 2. Physical activity limitation and the busy street barrier, both of which showed a statistically significant association with Bikeway use in the model based on self-reported data only (and in unadjusted analyses), were not retained in the GIS (geographic information system) predictive model.	**More Evidence Needed** Study design = Association Effect size = Not reported	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High The racial/ethnic composition of the study was consistent with that of the general Arlington population. A higher percentage of respondents were women (60% vs. 54%) and had a college degree (60% vs. 40%).
Author Romero, Robinson (2001) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to parks and safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (height and weight (body mass index [BMI]) and physical activity (Modified Self-administered Physical Activity Checklist [SAPAC])	**Negative Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals with fewer neighborhood hazards will participate in more physical activity, which will lead to lower body mass index [BMI].)** **Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Higher BMI was associated with the perception of fewer neighborhood hazards for children of lower SES (r= -0.13, p<0.05); this correlation was significant but low. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Contrary to the hypothesis, the perception of more neighborhood hazards was positively correlated with more reported physical activity (r=0.13, p<0.001). 3. For children of higher SES, the perception of more neighborhood hazards was associated with more reported physical activity [r=0.18, p<0.05]. (Note: Neighborhood hazard scales were a composite of accessibility and safety [traffic and crime] measures.)	**Negative Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for overweight/ obesity in the study population and negative association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Ainsworth, Wilcox (2003) South Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to recreational facilities and safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Meeting physical activity recommendations (2001 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals in neighborhoods with enablers of physical activity [street lights, good quality sidewalks, light traffic, etc.] present will be more likely to participate in increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. 34% of respondents reported having light traffic in the neighborhood and approached statistical significance for meeting physical activity recommendations (OR=1.53, CI=1.00-2.34).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Voorhees, Young (2003) Virginia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (lack of lighting and sidewalks, neighborhood safety, distance to locations, access to places for physical activity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity and meeting physical activity recommendations (Women and Physical Activity Survey and Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: Individuals with positive perceptions of neighborhood safety and access to places to be physically active will have increased levels of physical activity and will be more likely to meet recommendations for physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Women were more likely to be active (OR=1.36, 95% CI= 0.50–3.66) and meet recommendations (OR=1.66, 95% CI, 0.70–3.94) if vehicular traffic is light in the neighborhood.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Hooker, Wilson (2005) South Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (safety from traffic and crime, street lighting, unattended dogs) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity and meeting physical activity recommendations (survey and the 2001 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS])	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals with positive perceptions of neighborhood safety and the social environment and decreased barriers for physical activity [e.g., heavy traffic] are more likely to walk and meet recommended levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. White adults who perceived moderate traffic in their neighborhood were one half as likely to report meeting the walking recommendation compared with white adults who perceived heavy traffic in their neighborhood (moderate traffic OR: 0.52, CI: 0.31-0.87, p = 0.002).	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association overall for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High A proportion similar to the total population and racial distribution of the population were randomly selected from census tracts to guarantee a balance in the racial profile and the geographic distribution of the study sample. The proportion of African American and white adults in the final sample closely resembled the overall proportion of these adult populations in the county.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Suminski, Poston (2005) Midwestern USA **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (construction/integrity of sidewalks and streets, neighborhood traffic volume and speed, lighting, crime, aesthetics, availability of shops, parks, work, and schools) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking for exercise and for transportation (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Women (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Having a safe neighborhood with destinations within walking distance leads to increased physical activity and active transportation.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Women were 4.5 times more likely to walk for exercise in their neighborhood if neighborhood safety was average compared to below average (OR=4.5; 95%CI 1.01-20.72; $p<0.05$). 2. Women were more likely (threefold) to walk their dog if neighborhood safety was average versus below average (OR=3.3; 95% CI 1.01-11.08; $p<0.05$). (Note: Neighborhood "safety" was a composite score using traffic volume and speed, lighting, and crime.)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Women** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in women	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Troped, Saunders (2003) Massachusetts **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (safety from traffic and crime, land-use mix, street connectivity, hills, safety, and presence of trails) **Outcome(s) Affected** Recreation and transportation physical activity (Arlington Physical Activity and Bikeway Survey and the Monitoring of Trends and determinants in Cardiovascular Disease Optional Study of Physical Activity [MOSPA] survey)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals living in neighborhoods with increased enablers for physical activity will participate in more physical activity than those living near barriers for physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Participants who reported heavy traffic in their neighborhood also reported a higher level of participation in recreational physical activity (heavy traffic = 151.9[168.1], respectively both $p \leq 0.01$). 2. Traffic did not show statistically significant independent association with recreational physical activity.	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High The sample is not representative of the whole United States but rather populations with similar demographic and geographic variables.
Author Franzini, Elliot (2009) United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Activity friendly neighborhood* (neighborhood traffic, physical disorder, residential density) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (Youth Behavior Survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Perceptions of unsafe traffic and disorder lead to decreased physical activity in children.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The structural model for the ordinal measure of child obesity (underweight or normal weight, overweight, obese) suggested that neighborhood physical environment had no significant association with activity levels. (Note: Neighborhood physical environment was comprised of variables for traffic, density, land-use mix, and physical disorder.)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Sanderson, Foushee (2003) United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Active neighborhood* (access to safe, pleasant places to be active and/or walk, safety [traffic, crime, dogs, lighting], lack of sidewalk) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals in neighborhoods with positive social dynamics and enablers for physical activity like good quality sidewalks and access to places to be physically active will have increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environment variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. (Note: Environmental variables include a composite score of distance to places to walk, safety from crime, street lighting, unattended dogs, presence of sidewalks, and traffic safety. Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High Education level from the evaluation sample was similar to the Alabama BRFSS data for African-American women, however, income level was somewhat lower.
Author Motl, Dishman (2005) South Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (unattended dogs, gangs, crime, traffic safety, sidewalks, proximity to playgrounds, parks, or gyms; access to equipment for physical activity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (3-Day Physical Activity Recall [3DPAR])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Equipment accessibility and increased neighborhood safety lead to increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. With the baseline data, there was not a statistically significant relationship between neighborhood safety and physical activity (gamma=-0.03). 2. The path between the same latent variables across time (i.e., stability coefficients) was statistically significant for neighborhood safety (gamma=0.59), and physical activity (beta=0.46). There were statistically significant correlations among the environmental variables at baseline (phi=0.50). 3. With the baseline data, there was not a statistically significant relationship from neighborhood safety to self-efficacy (gamma=-0.14). There was a statistically significant relationship from self-efficacy to physical activity (beta=0.35), but not from neighborhood safety to physical activity (gamma =0.01). (Note: Neighborhood safety included safety from unattended dogs, gangs, crime, traffic safety, and presence of sidewalks. Equipment accessibility included access to sports equipment at home, such as balls and skates, as well as access to parks, playgrounds and facilities.)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
International				
Author Morrison, Thompson (2004) Scotland **Design** Intervention Evaluation Before and after study **Duration** Not Reported A market research company conducted before and after pedestrian counts at 3 locations on the affected road on Tuesday, June 27, 2000 and Thursday, June 28, 2001 between 8:00am and 6:00pm	**Measures** *Pedestrian friendly street design (construction of safety* [e.g., crosswalks] and traffic calming devices) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking, physical health status, pedestrian counts of children, adults and pensioners (questionnaire, pedestrian counts)	**Net Positive for Physical Activity in Lower-income Individuals (Safety-Traffic)** **Net Positive for Use of a Traffic Calming Area in Lower-income Individuals (Safety-Traffic)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. According to replies from the 2nd survey, 20% of respondents said that they walked in the area more as a result of the traffic calming scheme (95% CI: 14.1-25.9). 2. A smaller percentage of respondents reported cycling (3.8%, 95% CI: 0.8-6.8) or allowing children to play (11.8%, 95% CI: 6.7-16.9), walk (12.5%, 95%CI: 7.2-17.8), or cycle (11.6%, 95% CI: 6.6-16.6) as a result of the traffic calming scheme. USE OF A TRAFFIC CALMING AREA: 3. The pedestrian counts of children (aged <16 years old) increased at the 1st site (18% increase, 95%CI: 15.4-20.6), 2nd site (44.1% increase, 95%CI: 40.8-47.4) and 3rd site (40.0% increase, 95%CI: 36.9-43.1) from pre to post-intervention. 4. The pedestrian counts of adults (aged 16-60 years) increased at the 1st site (12.3% increase, 95%CI: 10.3-14.3), 2nd site (54.9% increase, 95%CI: 52.2-57.6) and 3rd site (11.4% increase, 95%CI: 9.6-13.2) from pre to post-intervention. 5. The pedestrian counts of pensioners (aged >60 years) increased at the 1st site (5.9% increase, 95%CI: 2.6-9), 2nd site (36.3% increase, 95%CI: 29.3-43.3), but decreased at the 3rd site (53.8% decrease, 95%CI:-48.3-59.3) from pre to post-intervention.	**More Evidence Needed** Study design = Intervention evaluation Intervention duration = Not reported Effect size= Net positive for lower-income individuals for physical activity	**Maintenance** Not Reported **Sampling / Representativeness** Low Participants were two-thirds women and older than the local population.
Author Giles-Corti, Donovan (2002); Giles-Corti, Donovan (2002); Giles-Corti, Donovan (2003); Giles-Corti, Macintyre (2003); McCormack, Giles-Corti (2007); McCormack, Giles-Corti (2008) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to destinations, land-use, road network distance, presence of sidewalks) *Access to mass transit* (distance to nearest public transit stations) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (height and weight [body mass index]), walking and achieving physical activity levels (survey)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: Individuals with greater access to places for physical activity and active transportation will be more likely to participate in greater amounts of physical activity, which will lead to decreased levels of overweight/obesity. Individuals with barriers to being physically active such as living near heavy traffic will be less likly to participate in physical activity and will have higher rates of overweight and obesity.)** **Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Overweight individuals were more likely to live on highways (OR=4.24; 95%CI: 1.62-11.09). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Respondents were more likely to walk for transport if they perceived more traffic and busy roads (OR=1.26, 95%CI: 1.01-1.56, p=0.038). 3. In comparison with those who had major traffic and no trees on their street, the odds of achieving recommended levels of walking were nearly 50% higher among those who lived on a street with one or both of these features (combined)R=1.49, 95%CI: 0.96-2.33).	**Positive Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/obesity and negative association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Carver, Timperio (2008) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood quality* (safety from traffic and crime) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA) (accelerometers)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in Boys (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Positive perceptions of neighborhood safety leads to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For children, there were no significant associations between parents' scores for road safety, incivilities, or personal safety of the child and MVPA during the specified periods. 2. Increased level of concern among adolescent girls about road safety was negatively associated with girls MVPA during evenings (unadjusted: β=-0.714, p=0.044) and total MVPA outside school hours on weekdays (unadjusted: β=-1.5, p=0.047). 3. For boys, parental agreement that there were traffic-slowing devices in local streets was negatively associated with MVPA before school (β=-6.109, 95% CI, -10.96 to -1.26) [no p-value provided]. 4. Adolescent girls whose parents agreed that there were traffic slowing devices on local streets, engaged in 12 minutes more MVPA on weekend days than those whose parents who did not share this view (unadjusted: β=12.2, p=0.022).	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in Boys** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in the study population, positive association for physical activity for girls and negative association for physical activity for boys	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High The 19 state primary schools varied in socioeconomic status. A sampling strategy that ensured adequate representation of children from high and low SES families was adopted.
Author De Vries, Bakker (2006) The Netherlands **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential vs. commercial space, type of residence, sports/ recreation facilities and playgrounds, green space and water, safe walking and cycling, garbage and dirt, traffic safety, and the activity friendliness of the neighborhood) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (7-day physical activity log)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Having a safe neighborhood and places to walk to will lead to increased levels of physical activity in children.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Children's physical activity was positively associated with 30-km speed zones (β=1.815; 95% CI=0.700, 2.929, p<0.05) in the neighborhood. 2. Children's physical activity was negatively associated with heavy traffic (lorry and bus) (β= -2.356; 95% CI= -3.587, -1.125) and frequency of striped crossings (β= -1.815; 95% CI -2.854, -0.776) (p<0.05 for all).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not reported No difference was found in weight, sex, or maternal education between the final and original samples.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Carver, Salmon (2005) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (distance of locations to house, accessibility of convenience stores) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking and cycling behaviors (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Boys** **(Assumption: Positive adolescent and parent perceptions of the safety of their neighborhood and of access to places to be active leads to increased physical activity in adolescents.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1.Girls' perceptions of road safety was positively associated with frequency (β=0.179, p<0.05) and duration (β=0.183, p<0.01) of walking for transport on weekdays, frequency of walking for exercise on weekdays (β=0.094, p<0.01), duration of walking for exercise on weekends (β=0.184, p<0.05), and frequency of walking the dog on weekends (β=0.128, p<0.05). 2. Parents' perception that there was so much traffic that it was difficult/unpleasant to go for a walk was negatively associated with girls' frequency (β=-0.164, p<0.01) and duration (β=-0.161, p<0.05) of cycling for recreation on weekends, girls' frequency (β=-0.190, p<0.01) and duration (β=-0.188, p<0.01) of walking for exercise on weekdays, girls' duration of cycling for recreation on weekdays (β=-0.109, 0.05), girls' duration of walking to school (β=-0.128, p<0.01), and boys' frequency of walking for transport on weekdays (β=-0.138,p<0.05).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Boys** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population and in girls and boys	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Harrison, Gemmell (2007) United Kingdom **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, accessibility to transport, shopping, and leisure facilities; neighborhood disorder [crime, vandalism, assault], perceptions of traffic safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (Godin and Shephard instrument)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Having access to places to safely walk leads to greater levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. People who thought that there was some problem with speeding traffic in their neighborhood (relative prevalence 1.08, 95% CI=1.10 to 1.14) were more likely to be physically active, but this was not consistent as a serious problem.	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Lee, Kawakubo (2007) Japan **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (accessibility, safety, convenience, aesthetics) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Positive perceptions of neighborhood safety, social support, convenience, and access to active transportation lead to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In the low walkable region, those who had high scores for "It is easy to cross streets" (low perception mean [sd]: 145.1[162.7] vs. high perception mean [sd]: 214.6[270.2], p<0.05) spent significantly more time walking.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Hume, Timperio (2009); Timperio, Crawford (2004) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (perceptions of traffic, strangers and overall safety, walking distance, road safety, sports facilities, public transport, neighborhood infrastructure, design, and aesthetics) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking/cycling behavior, active commuting (parental questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls (Safety-Traffic)** **No Association for Physical Activity in Boys (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Positive neighborhood perceptions of traffic, safety, social support and neighborhood infrastructure lead to increased active commuting.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Baseline* 1. Five to six year old boys whose parents believed that there was heavy traffic in their area were 2.8 times more likely (95% CI=1.1, 6.8, p<0.05) to walk or cycle at least three times per week than other children. 2. Ten to twelve year old boys whose parents believed that there were no lights or crossings for their child to use were 60% less likely to walk or cycle (OR=0.4, 95% CI=0.2, 0.7, p<0.01). 3. A lower likelihood of walking or cycling among older girls, was associated with parent's belief that their child needed to cross several roads to reach play areas (OR=0.4, 95% CI=0.2, 0.8, p<0.01). *Follow-up* 4. Adolescents whose parents reported that there were no traffic lights or crossings available were only half as likely (OR=0.4; CI=0.2, 0.8; p=0.01) to increase their active commuting, while those whose parents were satisfied with the number of pedestrian crossings in their neighborhood were twice as likely (OR=2.4; CI=1.1, 5.4; p=0.03) to increase their active commuting.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls (Safety-Traffic)** **No Association for Physical Activity in Boys (Safety-Traffic)** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population, girls and boys	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Kondo, Lee (2009) Japan **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (household count, land use type count, length of streets and sidewalks, intersection count, width of streets, residential density, land use mix-diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, aesthetics, and traffic and crime safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking/cycling behavior (accelerometers and the International Physical Activity Questionnaire [IPAQ])	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **No Association for Physical Activity in Males (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Positive perceptions of safety from crime and traffic and living in an environment that decreases barriers will lead to increased walking for physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There were no differences in mean walking time for transport or cycling time for transport related to neighborhood environment perception scores between the high and low scoring groups. 2. For males, there were no differences in walking steps between the high scoring group and the low scoring group for residential density, land use mix-diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, and safety. (Note: Multiple GIS and perception measures were used to determine respondent's walkability score.)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **No Association for Physical Activity in Males** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in the study population or males	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Low Those who responded to the questionnaire and wore accelerometers were significantly older than those who did not.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Craig, Brownson (2002) Canada **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability (*number of facilities, mix of facilities, accessible to pedestrian, walking routes, connection to transport modes and traffic, amount and variety of stimuli, aesthetics, time and effort, traffic threats, safety from crime, potential for crime) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking to work (1996 Canadian Census self-administered questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **(Assumption: Access to walkable routes for pedestrians and positive perceptions of neighborhood safety and the social environment lead to increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The degree of urbanization altered the relationship between the environment score and walking to work (no statistical data). 2. The predicted environment score was lower in both small urban (T-ratio (23)=-3.61, p=0.002; Coefficient; -0.77) and suburban neighborhoods (T-ratio (23)=-4.42, p<0.001; Coefficient=-0.12) than in urban neighborhoods. 3. Walking to work was significantly related to the environment score (T-ratio (25)=3.32, p=0.003), with a one-unit increase in the score being associated with a 25-percentage-point increase in the percentage walking to work. 4. The environment score was related to the percentage walking to work, controlling for degree of urbanization (T-ratio (23)=2.03, p=0.054; Coefficient=0.02). (Note: An environment score based on 18 neighborhood characteristics (e.g., variety of destinations, visual aesthetics, accessibility, transportation systems and safety from traffic and crime) was developed with a higher score indicating a more walkable environment. This score was a composite of many different characteristics incorporating multiple strategies.)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not reported The observed neighborhoods were known for diversity of urban design, social class, and economic status.
Author Carnegie, Bauman (2002) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood quality* (aesthetics, accessibility, safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (1996 Physical Activity Survey for the State of New South Wales [NSW])	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Stages of Change in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Individuals with positive safety perceptions of their neighborhood will participate in greater amounts of physical activity, which will be reflected through the stages of change.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Those who walked more than 2 hours per week (M=2.96, SD=1.1) strongly agreed that they perceived traffic to be bothersome more than those who walked less than 20 minutes per week (M=3.15, SD=1.12; F(2, 1.168)=5.19; p=0.006). STAGE OF CHANGE: 2. There was an independent association between the stage of change variable and the aesthetic environment (F (2, 1.168) = 5.67; p<0.01) and with the practical environment factor (F (2, 1.157) =12.05; p<0.001).	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High The demographic composition of the sample was very similar to that provided by the most recent national census data. Respondents aged 40-45 were slightly overrepresented (29.2%), and those aged 56-60 years were slightly underrepresented (20.1%). Two percent of the resident population within the target age range were sampled for this study.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Timperio, Salmon (2005) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Active neighborhoods* (proximity to places to be active and traffic density) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight and obesity (measured height and weight and computed body mass index [BMI])	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: Positive parent and child perceptions of the neighborhood will lead to increased physical activity, which will ead to lower rates of overweight and obesity.)** **Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Children whose parents believed there was heavy traffic in their local streets were 40% more likely to be overweight or obese, compared to other children (OR= 1.4, 95% CI= 1.0-1.8, p≤ 0.05). 2. 10-12 year-old children whose parents were concerned about road safety were almost 4 times as likely as other children to be obese (OR= 3.9, 95% CI= 1.0-15.2, p≤0.05).	**Positive Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/ obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Humpel, Owen (2004) Humpel, Marshall (2004) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood quality* (safety from traffic and crime) *Neighborhood walkability* (perceptions of access to aesthetically pleasing and convenient places to be active) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking (survey assessed frequency and duration of neighborhood weekly walking, type of walking [e.g., transport] and the International Physical Activity Questionnaire [IPAQ]-short form items assessed intensity, frequency, and duration of physical activity, total physical activity)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Females (Safety-Traffic)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in Males (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Perceiving the environment as aesthetically pleasing, convenient, and perceiving traffic as not being a problem increases physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Men* 1. Men who perceived traffic as being less of a problem were found to be less likely to have increased their walking across all three outcome variables (any increase in walking; OR=0.40, 95%CI=0.22-0.72, p<0.01, increase of 30 minutes; OR=0.29, 95%CI=0.15-0.54, p<0.001, increase of 60 minutes; OR=0.39, 95%CI= 0.21-0.73, p<0.01). *Women* 2. Increased perceptions that traffic was not a problem were significantly associated with women being 1.76 (95%CI=1.01-3.05, p<0.05) times more likely to have increased their walking for 30 minutes or more.	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Females** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in Males** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in the study population, positive association for physical activity in females, negative association for physical activity in males	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported Participants did not differ in their responses whether they were part of the original sample or follow-up.
Author Burton, Turrell (2005) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Active neighborhoods* (access to places to be active, safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking, moderate-intensity and vigorous-intensity physical activity, and total physical activity (questionnaire)	**More Evidence Needed-Data Not Provided (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: In neighborhoods with increased access to safe places to be physically active inside and out and individuals will participate in more physical activity.)** **Safety-Traffic** ENVIRONMENT: 1. Environmental variables (physical features, aesthetic features, traffic, facilities) contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity. 2. The proportion of unique variation (Nagelkerke r^2) accounted for in walking, moderate-intensity, vigorous-intensity activity, and total physical activity by the environmental correlate group is 0.6, 1.1, 0.4, and 1.2, respectively. (Note: The environmental scale was developed from a battery of items, which led to the inclusion of multiple strategies. Environmental variables include footpaths [sidewalks], public transport, street lighting, perceived safety, busyness of streets and traffic flow, facilities for activity, cleanliness, and friendliness.)	**More Evidence Needed** Study design = Association Effect size = More evidence needed	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Hume, Salmon (2007) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to shops, parks, school, public open spaces, public transit, recreation center, perceived safety [strangers, unattended dogs, bullies, graffiti, litter, traffic], aesthetics, crosswalks) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking and cycling behavior (accelerometers and a student questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumption: Perceiving the presence of increased neighborhood aesthetics, opportunities for physical activity, access to destinations, and neighborhood safety leads to increased physical activity levels and walking.)** **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Among girls, safety in the neighborhood for walking/cycling to school (β=2.78, p=0.03) and safety when crossing the road (β=1.99, p=0.07) were significantly positively associated with walking frequency. Easy to walk/cycle and lots of graffiti remained significantly associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (both p<0.05).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population, and girls	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Panter, Jones (2008) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, street connectivity, walking/ cycling facilities (such as sidewalks and pedestrian/ bike trails) aesthetics and pedestrian traffic safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Weekly activity and weekly aerobic activity (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Traffic)** **(Assumptions: Access to places for physical activity in the community and increased street accessibility and safety from traffic will lead to increased levels of physical activity. Increased levels of physical activity will lead to lower rates of overweight and obesity.)** **Safety Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=2.46, 95%CI= 1.63-3.71, p<0.05) was more strongly associated with the odds of being obese and inactive than normal and active. 2. Feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=1.65, 95%CI=1.2-2.27, p<0.05) was more strongly associated with the odds of being obese than normal weight. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	**Positive Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/ obesity and physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

IMPACT TABLES

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
United States						
Author Joshu, Boehmer (2008) and Brownson, Baker (2001) USA	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 45.7% Minority: 54.3% White, 29.4% Black, 2.1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.7% Indian/ Alaskan native, 11% Other, 0.4% missing/ unknown, 39.3% Lower-income 67.1% Female (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic barriers (safety) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to places to exercise (e.g., shopping malls, parks, trails) 2. Presence of sidewalks and aesthetic quality of the neighborhood 3. Urban sprawl factors (e.g., residential density) COMPLEX: 1. Social and personal barriers **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Hierarchical linear modeling found that the effect of sprawl on BMI is greater for individuals who report a greater number of personal barriers. The effect of sprawl on BMI increased by -0.006 with each additional personal barrier. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Access to parks (adjusted OR=1.95, 95% CI=1.52, 2.52), indoor gyms (adjusted OR=1.94, 95% CI=1.45, 2.60), and treadmills (adjusted OR=1.48, 95% CI=1.13, 1.93) were positively associated with physical activity. 2. An increase in the number of perceived neighborhood barriers increased the odds of being obese (chi-square for linear trend, p<0.05). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. An increase in the number of perceived neighborhood barriers increased the odds of being obese (chi-square for linear trend, p<0.05). 2. The presence of sidewalks was the most important neighborhood variable among those with higher incomes (OR = 1.46, 95% CI = 1.08, 1.97). 3. Neighborhood characteristics, including the presence of sidewalks (OR=1.28, 95% CI=1.02, 1.59), enjoyable scenery (OR=1.46, 95% CI=1.13, 1.88), heavy traffic (OR=1.28, 95% CI=1.04, 1.58), and hills (OR=1.28, 95% CI=1.04, 1.58), were positively associated with physical activity. 4. Among those with lower incomes, the most important neighborhood variable for physical activity was enjoyable scenery (OR = 1.53, 95% CI = 1.07, 2.18). (Note: Neighborhood barriers were assessed with a composite score including absence of sidewalks, absence of trails, absence of aesthetic quality, absence of hills, presence of heavy traffic, presence of pollution, and presence of unattended dogs.)	1. An increase in the number of personal barriers increased the odds of being obese (chi-square for linear trend, p<0.001). 2.Obese individuals in small metropolitan (adjusted OR= 2.3, 95% CI: 1.05-5.2) and micropolitan areas (adjusted OR= 4.8, 95% CI: 1.6-14.2) were more likely to report being self-conscious about the appearance while active. 3. Obese residents of micropolitan areas were more likely to report no time for activity (adjusted OR= 2.6, 95% CI: 1.1-6.1). Fear of injury (adjusted OR= 4.1, 95% CI: 1.2-14.1) and dislike of exercise (adjusted OR= 3.9, 95% CI: 1.3-11.7) were strongly associated with obesity in rural areas compared with other areas. 4. Two policy variables were positively associated with physical activity: believing that employers should provide time for exercise (adjusted OR=1.27, 95% CI=1.01, 2.01), and support for the use of local government funds for walking or jogging trails (adjusted OR=1.42, 95% CI=1.00, 2.01). 5. Among individuals indicating some degree of physical activity, the following environmental supports were associated with reports of increases in activity: neighborhood streets (22.6% of respondents), shopping malls (25.9%), parks (28.5%), walking and jogging trails (29.9%), treadmills (30.6%), and indoor gyms (33.7%).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author McGinn, Evenson (2007) Mississippi and North Carolina	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 57.0% White, 38.2% Black (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of high-speeds and traffic as barriers for physical activity MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Street connectivity 2. Presence and absence of sidewalks and crosswalks **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Forsyth County, NC* 1. Individuals with perceptions of walkable destinations present within their neighborhoods were associated with meeting recommendations for walking for any purpose and any transportation activity (OR=1.7, 95%CI= 1.1-2.8, p<0.05). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Forsyth County, NC* 1. Those whose half-mile neighborhoods had high connectivity were more likely to be insufficiently active than inactive during outdoor leisure activity (OR=1.5, 95%CI=1.0-2.2, p<0.05). 2. When examining the eighth-mile buffer, neighborhoods with high connectivity were less likely to meet recommendations or to be insufficiently active than to be inactive during leisure activity and for walking for any purpose (meets recommendations; OR=0.7, 95%CI=0.4-1.0, p<0.05, insufficiently inactive; OR=0.7, 95%CI=0.5-1.0, p<0.05, insufficiently inactive; OR=0.7, 95%CI=0.4-1.0, p<0.05). 3. Individuals that perceived the absence of crosswalks as not a barrier for physical activity were associated with decreased odds of being active (OR=0.6, 95%CI=0.4-1.0, p<0.05). 4. Individuals that perceived the absence of sidewalks as not a barrier for physical activity were associated with increased odds of activity particularly when examining insufficiently active versus inactive individuals during outdoor leisure activity (OR=1.4, 95%CI=1.0- 2.1, p<0.05). 5. Individuals with perceptions that the absence of crosswalks were not a barrier for physical activity were associated with decreased odds of being active, particularly for being insufficiently active vs. inactive during outdoor leisure activity (OR=0.6, 95% CI= 0.4, 1.0, p<0.05). *Jackson, MS* 6. Individuals perceiving that a lack of crosswalks was not a problem were associated with being insufficiently active rather than inactive for leisure activity and outdoor leisure activity (OR=1.7, 95%CI=1.1-2.6, p<0.05 and OR=1.4, 95%CI=1.0-2.2, p<0.05, respectively). 7. Individuals who did not perceive a lack of crosswalks as a barrier for physical activity had increased odds of being active during leisure activity and outdoor leisure activity (OR=1.8, 95%CI=1.0-3.2, p<0.05 and OR=2.3, 95%CI=1.4-3.9, p<0.05, respectively). *Both Sites* 1. Perceiving that there were enough crosswalks in the neighborhood was associated with decreased odds of engaging in any transportation activity (OR=0.7, 95%CI=0.5-1.0, p<0.05 for both sites)	No associations were seen between objectively measured speed and street characteristics for any of the outcomes in any of the three neighborhood sizes in Jackson.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Boehmer, Lovegreen (2006) Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 74.4% Female, 93.4% White; 36.8% income <$25,000, 59.1%, income >$25,000; 27% obese; 31% overweight (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT 1. Access to recreational facilities. 2. Land-use mix and distance to grocery stores 3. Condition of walking routes including sidewalks and shoulders and neighborhood aesthetics 4. Perceptions of safety from crime and physical disorder 5. Access to fruits and vegetables, and access to grocery stores **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Street Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Having no sidewalks or shoulders on most streets was not significantly associated with obesity. 2. Finding the community somewhat pleasant (OR=1.44, 95%CI= 1.13-1.92) or not pleasant (OR=1.85; 95%CI=1.31-2.59, p<0.05) was associated with being obese. 3. Women had stronger associations between obesity and indicators of poor aesthetics (OR= 1.3, 95% CI= 1.0-1.7 for interesting things; OR= 1.7, 95% CI= 1.2-2.3 for well-maintained). 4. Finding the community somewhat pleasant (OR=1.73, 95%CI= 1.28-2.34) or not pleasant (OR=2.02, 95% CI= 1.29-3.15, p<0.05) was all associated with being obese/inactive. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Perceived lack of equipment for physical activity was associated with being obese (OR= 1.8, 95% CI= 1.3-2.4) and obese/inactive (OR= 1.8, 95% CI= 1.2-2.7) among only women. 2. Neighborhood perceptions of a lack of places to be physically active (OR=1.46, 95%CI= 1.1-1.94) and no available equipment (OR=1.55, 95%CI=1.19-2.02) was associated with being obese. 3. Furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=1.53, 95% CI= 1.1-2.11) was a neighborhood environmental perception associated with being obese. 4. Furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=2.74, 95% CI= 1.68-4.48) was a neighborhood environmental perception associated with being obese. **Availability of Food Stores** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Further distance to the nearest supermarket was associated with increased odds of obesity (OR: 1.8, 95% CI= 1.3-2.4). 2. The availability and quality of fresh fruits were not significantly associated with obesity. **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Women had stronger associations between obesity and feeling slightly or not at all safe from crime (OR= 2.4; 95% CI= 1.6-3.5). 2. Feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.91, 95%CI= 1.86-2.55, p<0.05) was more strongly associated with the odds of being obese/inactive. 3. Feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.09, 95%CI= 1.5-2.92, p<0.05) and having an unmaintained community (OR=1.48, 95%CI=1.09-1.99) were more strongly associated with the odds of being obese. 4. Feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.59, 95% CI= 1.56-4.28) was a neighborhood environmental perception associated with being obese. 5. Feeling unsafe from crime (OR=1.71, 95% CI= 1.19-2.46) was a neighborhood environmental perception associated with being obese. 6. Having an unmaintained community (OR=1.48, 95%CI=1.09-1.99) was associated with being obese. *(continued next page)*	1. An increase in the number of personal barriers increased the odds of being obese (chi-square for linear trend, p<0.001). 2.Obese individuals in small metropolitan (adjusted OR= 2.3, 95% CI: 1.05-5.2) and micropolitan areas (adjusted OR= 4.8, 95% CI: 1.6-14.2) were more likely to report being self-conscious about the appearance while active. 3. Obesity residents of micropolitan areas were more likely to report no time for activity (adjusted OR= 2.6, 95% CI: 1.1-6.1). Fear of injury (adjusted OR= 4.1, 95% CI: 1.2-14.1) and dislike of exercise (adjusted OR= 3.9, 95% CI: 1.3-11.7) were strongly associated with obesity in rural areas compared with other areas. 4. Two policy variables were positively associated with physical activity: believing that employers should provide time for exercise (adjusted OR=1.27, 95% CI=1.01, 2.01), and support for the use of local government funds for walking or jogging trails (adjusted OR=1.42, 95% CI=1.00, 2.01). 5. Among individuals indicating some degree of physical activity, the following environmental supports were associated with reports of increases in activity: neighborhood streets (22.6% of respondents), shopping malls (25.9%), parks (28.5%), walking and jogging trails (29.9%), treadmills (30.6%), and indoor gyms (33.7%).

(Continued from previous study)						
					Community Design OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. In a stratified analysis neighborhood perceptions of having no or a few destinations within close proximity (3-6 destinations: OR=2.03, 95%CI= 1.33-3.09; 1-2 destinations: OR=1.72,95%CI= 1.13-2.62; none: OR=1.63, 95%CI= 1.07-2.5) was associated with being obese/inactive. 2. In a stratified analysis further distance to the nearest supermarket was associated with increased odds of obesity (OR: 1.8, 95% CI= 1.3-2.4). 3. In a stratified analysis few or moderate number of destinations within close proximity (3-6 destinations: OR=1.49, 95%CI= 1.08-2.06; 1-2 destinations: OR=1.42,95%CI= 1.03-1.97) was associated with being obese. 4. Using a multivariate analysis showed that furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=2.74, 95% CI= 1.68-4.48) and having 3-6 destination types near home (OR=1.76, 95%CI= 1.09-2.84) were neighborhood environmental perceptions associated with being obese. 5. Using a multivariate analysis showed that furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=1.53, 95% CI= 1.1-2.11) was a neighborhood environmental perception associated with being obese. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Lee, Vernez-Moudon (2006) Washington	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided Adults, 10% Minority, 90% White, 54% Female,16% age 66 years or older (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety in the neighborhood MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Land-use mix and density 2. Sidewalk quality **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Objective Correlates of Walking* 1. Distance to the closest office and mixed use neighborhood centers for both-walkers (OR=2.591, CI: 1.463-4.587, p<0.01), the recreation walker (OR=2.233, CI: 1.198-4.161, p<0.05), and the transportation walker (OR=2.503, CI: 1.314-4.768, p<0.01) was significant in all models. 2. Area level residential density was found significant in all models for both recreational and transport walkers (OR= 0.135, CI: 0.036-0.511, p<0.01), and independently for the recreation walkers (OR= 0.101, CI; 0.024-0.421, p<0.05), and the transportation walker (OR= 0.186, CI: 0.043-0.798, p<0.05). 3. Parcel-level density (OR=2.740, CI: 1.239-6.056, p<0.05) showed a positive association with the likelihood of walking for both purposes relative to not walking at all. 4. Area based density (OR=0.135, CI: 0.036-0.511, p<0.001) showed a negative association with the likelihood of walking for both purposes relative to not walking at all. 5. Frequent walkers have a 17% decreased odds of walking (OR=0.825, 95% CI= 0.688-0.989, p<0.05) for transportation compared to non-walkers in a sloped environment. 5. Moderate walkers had a 56% decreased odds of walking if they perceived their neighborhood as having a mix or only commercial atmosphere when (OR=0.441, CI: 0.200-0.972, p<0.05) compared to non-walkers. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Longer sidewalks were positively associated with recreation walking (frequent walking; OR=1.117, CI: 1.001-1.245, p<0.05).	1. With increased social support, the odds of transportation walking were 1.7 times higher for moderate walkers (OR=1.765, CI: 1.247-2.494, p<0.01) and 2.7 times higher for frequent walkers when compared to non-walkers (OR=2.652, CI: 1.673-4.203, p<0.01). 2. Frequent walkers have a 15% increased odds of walking for recreation compared to non-walkers in a sloped environment.
Author Catlin, Simoes (2003) Missouri	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults , 52% Female, 71% White, 27.3% Black, 1.8% other ethnicity, 35.2% overweight, 23.9% obese (sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceived traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to facilities for physical activity (indoor and outdoor, trails, parks) 2. Availability of healthy food at work 3. Perceived criminal safety **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Individuals who perceived their neighborhood or community to have 1, 2, or 3 negative characteristics were 14% (95%CI: 0.93-1.4), 23% (95%CI: 0.91-1.66), and 56% (95%CI: 3.06-2.28) more likely to be overweight, respectively, than individuals who perceived their neighborhood to be safe and pleasant. (Note: A four level composite variable was computed for perceived community factors, with zero representing an environment that is crime safe, traffic safe, and pleasant.) **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. The absence of public outdoor exercise facilities was significantly associated with overweight (OR=1.21; 95% CI: 1.00-1.45). **Street Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Employed persons reporting the absence of sidewalks and shoulders were 1.74 times more likely to be overweight (95% CI: 1.26-2.40).	1. Persons who were given time to exercise at work were nearly 20% less likely to be overweight (OR=0.83; 95% CI: 0.63-1.09).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Zhu, Lee (2009) Texas	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-12 year olds, Urban and Suburban (evaluation sample) 55.4% Hispanic, 60.3% eligible for free or reduced lunch (2005-2006 Austin Independent School District)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to quality walking routes (good condition sidewalks, tree shade, and street lights 2. Distance and land-use mix **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. A child was about 4 times more likely to walk if the parent perceived the distance to be close enough for the child to walk (coefficient= 1.390, OR=4.014, 95% CI=3.128-5.150, p<0.001). 2. The presence of certain features such as convenience stores (coefficient= -0.548, OR=0.578, 95% CI= 0.432-0.774, p<0.001) and office buildings (coefficient=-0.536, OR=0.585, 95% CI=0.393-0.872, p<0.05) en route were negative correlates with walking behavior. **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The presence of bus stops (coefficient= -0.305, OR=0.737, 95% CI= 0.580-0.936, p<0.05) were negative correlates with walking behavior. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Sidewalk availability and quality (maintenance, width, buffers from traffic, and no obstructions) was not significantly associated with children's walking behaviors. 2. Maintenance, tree shade, quietness, street lighting, and perceived convenience of walking were marginally significantly related to walking (coefficient= 0.108, OR=1.114, 95% CI= 0.991-1.252, p<0.1).	1. Children were less likely to walk (coefficient= -1.201, OR=0.301, 95% CI=0.224-0.404, p<0.001) if schools provided bus services.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Grow, Saelens (2008) Massachusetts, Ohio, California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 11-18 year old adolescents Parents: 80.5% White, 9.2% Black, and 5.7% Other Adolescents: 75.0% White, 18.8% Black, 2.7% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3.6% Other (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to recreational facilities 2. Presence of recreational facilities 3. Street connectivity and pedestrian infrastructure **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Adolescents who usually walked/biked to at least 5 sites (site median) had higher scores on perceived pedestrian infrastructure both by parent report and self-report and had higher street connectivity for adolescent report only (no statistics). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Living within a 10-min walk of large parks (Report for children; 69.2% active, p<0.05, Report for adolescents; 55.9% active, p<0.01, Adolescent report; 47.6% active; p<0.01) and public open spaces (Report for children; 59.5% active, p<0.01, Report for Adolescents; 30.4% active, p<0.05, Adolescent report; 36% adolescents active, p<0.01) were associated with increased likelihood of being active at those sites. 2. Multivariate analysis of parent report revealed that site proximity was only associated with adolescents' swimming pool use (RR=2.1, p<0.05). **Availaiblity of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Living within a 10-min walk of large parks (Report for children; 69.2% active, p<0.05, Report for adolescents; 55.9% active, p<0.01, Adolescent report; 47.6% active; p<0.01) and public open spaces (Report for children; 59.5% active, p<0.01, Report for Adolescents; 30.4% active, p<0.05, Adolescent report; 36% adolescents active, p<0.01) were associated with increased likelihood of being active at those sites. 2. Multivariate analysis of parent report revealed that site proximity was only associated with adolescents' swimming pool use (RR=2.1, p<0.05). (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Kerr, Rosenberg (2006) Washington	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Parents: 20-65 years old, 83.3% White, 16.7% Minority Children: 45.9% were >12 years old (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Diverse land use mix 2. Access to local walking facilities 3. Perceptions of neighborhood safety (crime) 4. Neighborhood aesthetics **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Perceived access to local stores and biking or walking facilities accounted for some of the effect of walkability on active commuting (OR=2.0, 95% CI=1.03-4.00, p<0.05). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Having stores within a 20-minute walk were independently associated with active commuting (store distance; OR= 3.2, 95%CI= 1.68-6.01, p<0.05). 2. Perceived access to local stores and biking or walking facilities accounted for some of the effect of walkability on active commuting (OR=2.0, 95% CI=1.03-4.00, p<0.05). **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Parent concerns were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR= 5.2, 95%CI 2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 2. A parental concerns scale was most strongly associated with child active commuting (OR=5.2, 95% CI= 2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 3. Parent concerns were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR=4.9, 95% CI=2.54-9.40). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood aesthetics were independently associated with active commuting (OR=2.5, 95% CI=1.33-4.80, p<0.05). 2. Neighborhood aesthetics were independently associated with active commuting (OR=2.4, 95% CI=1.23-4.56, p<0.05). (Note: Parental concerns were based on a scale that included both interpersonal and traffic fears. Distance to nearest PA resources and access to PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. Parents of children aged 12-18 had significantly fewer concerns about active commuting (p=0.004) than parents of children 5-11 years old.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author King, Toobert (2006) California, Oregon, Georgia, Rhode Island, Tennessee	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, Elderly, African-American, Lower-income (target population) 55 years and older (Stanford); 18-72 years old (Atlanta); 65 years and older (Rhode Island); 10.6% minorities (California); 3.3% minorities (Oregon); 97.7% minority (Georgia); 1.9% minority (Rhode Island); 100% minority (Tennessee) (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime 2. Land-use mix and street connectivity 3. Alternative routes and street connectivity **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Seeing stray or loose dogs in one's neighborhood was negatively associated with minutes per week of moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity in the Atlanta sample (parameter estimate=-63.2(218), p=0.006, total R^2=6.7) and was negatively associated with hours per week walking for errands at the Memphis site (parameter estimate = -0.27(73), p=0.04, total R^2=26.0). Seeing stray or loose dogs in one's neighborhood was negatively associated with minutes per week of leisurely walking at the Memphis (parameter estimate=-0.45(73), p=0.03, total R^2=13.9) and Atlanta sites (parameter estimate=-0.30(251), p=0.017, total R^2=6.3). 2. Seeing stray or loose dogs in one's neighborhood was negatively associated with minutes per week of leisurely walking at the Memphis (parameter estimate=-0.45(73), p=0.03, total R^2=13.9) and Atlanta sites (parameter estimate=-0.30(251), p=0.017, total R^2=6.3). 3. In Oregon, participants who strongly agreed that their neighborhood was generally safe showed more minutes per week of 24-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by approximately 150 minutes or more per week) relative to intervention participants reporting their neighborhoods as being less safe. 4. In Oregon, the neighborhood traffic and crime-related safety subscale reached statistical significance (F for interaction term= 5.9[1,117], p=0.016). Participants who strongly agreed that "my neighborhood is safe enough that I would let a 10-year old boy walk around my block alone in the daytime" showed more minutes per week of 24-month moderate-intensity or more vigorous physical activity (by approximately 150 minutes per week) relative to intervention participants reporting lower levels of this item. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Stores within easy walking distance of home were positively associated with minutes per week of walking for errands at the Stanford site (parameter estimate=0.34(93), p=0.048, total R^2=15.6) and minutes per week of leisurely walking at the Atlanta site (parameter estimate=0.25(251), p=0.03, total R^2=6.3). 2. Living in a neighborhood of mostly detached, single-family homes was positively associated with minutes per week of moderate- and/or-vigorous intensity physical activity at the Oregon site (parameter estimate=139.0(121), p=0.02, total R^2=7.7) and negatively associated with minutes per week of leisurely walking at the Rhode Island site (parameter estimate= -1.1(94), p=0.05, total R^2=11.2). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Having many alternative routes when going from place to place was positively associated with minutes per week of walking for errands at the Oregon site (parameter estimate=0.35(121), p=0.02, total R^2=6.6).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Weir, Etelson (2006) New York	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Urban, Lower-income, 5-10 year olds (target population) >25% children live below the poverty line, 40% of residents are non-English speakers; 76% Hispanic, 11% Black, 5% White, 2% Other, 5% Not answered, mean age= 7.4±1.9 years (Inner city evaluation sample) Primarily middle-class, Caucasian population; 50% White, 16% Hispanic, 17% Black, 7% Other, 10% Not answered, mean age= 6.9±1.6 years (Suburban Community evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Inner city children were more likely to not participate in any organized sports or dance programs (58% vs. 30%, p<0.0001), nor participate in organized sports or play outside except when accompanied by an adult (21% vs. 4%, p<0.0001) compared with suburban children. Inner city children's physical activity levels were negatively correlated with parental anxiety about neighborhood safety (r= -0.18, p<0.05, n=188). No correlation was found for suburban children (p=0.35, n=97). (Note: Safety was a composite score of interpersonal and traffic safety indicators.)	1. In comparison with suburban parents, inner city parents were more likely to worry about their child being threatened by gangs (70% vs. 12%, p<0.001), worry that other children might hurt their child (62%, vs. 14%, p<0.0001), feel that there was no safe play area in their neighborhood (36% vs. 9%, p<0.0001), believe it is dangerous to let a child play outside (58% vs. 8%, p<0.0001), feel that traffic is a problem (60% vs. 27%, p<0.0001), believe that the neighborhood crime rate makes it unsafe to play outdoors (50% vs. 3%, p<0.0001), and feel personally unsafe in their own neighborhood (48% vs. 3%, p<0.0001).
Author Troped, Saunders (2001) Massachusetts	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 6% minority [evaluation sample]	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Distance to a community rail-trail (Minuteman Bikeway) **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** BIKEWAY USE: 1. Self-reported distance was inversely associated with use of the Bikeway. Survey participants were 0.65 times as likely to use the Minuteman Bikeway for every 0.25-mile increase in self-reported distance from the trail (95%CI= 0.54-0.79). 2. Survey participants located further from the trail as measured by GIS road network distance in the GIS multivariate model were less likely to use the Bikeway (OR=0.58, 95%CI=0.45-0.73). 3. In the GIS multivariate model, respondents who did not have to traverse a steep hill were almost twice as likely to be Bikeway users compared to those who had to cross a steep hill (OR=1.90, 95%CI= 1.09-3.32).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Romero, Robinson (2001) California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-10 year olds, (Mean=9 [±0.37] years, 50% Male, 49.9% Latino, 32.9% Asian, 8.1% Pacific Islander/Filipino, 5.5% European American, and 3.6% African American, 59% lower socioeconomic status (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Neighborhood perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to parks 2. Neighborhood perceptions of safety from crime **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Higher BMI was associated with the perception of fewer neighborhood hazards for children of lower SES (r= -0.13, p<0.05); this correlation was significant but low. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Contrary to the hypothesis, the perception of more neighborhood hazards was positively correlated with more reported physical activity (r=0.13, p<0.001) 3. For children of higher SES, the perception of more neighborhood hazards was associated with more reported physical activity [r=0.18, p<0.05]. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Higher BMI was associated with the perception of fewer neighborhood hazards for children of lower SES (r= -0.13, p<0.05); this correlation was significant but low. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Contrary to the hypothesis, the perception of more neighborhood hazards was positively correlated with more reported physical activity (r=0.13, p<0.001) 3. For children of higher SES, the perception of more neighborhood hazards was associated with more reported physical activity [r=0.18, p<0.05]. (Note: Neighborhood hazard scales were a composite of accessibility and safety [traffic and crime] measures.)	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Ainsworth, Wilcox (2003) South Carolina	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, African-American, Females (target sample) 20 to 50 years old (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Presence and absence of sidewalks and street lighting COMPLEX: 1. Neighborhood social support (belonging to community groups) **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. 22.8% of respondents reported the presence of sidewalks in the neighborhood and were more likely to meet recommendations for physical activity (OR=1.57, 95% CI=1.14-2.17).	1. The most commonly cited reasons for not exercising more were personal barriers, enablers, motivators, lack of time (36.2%, 34.5%); lack of willpower (15.0%, 10.9%); and being too tired or lacking energy (12.2%, 9.2%). 2. The most commonly cited factors that would get participants to exercise more were more time (24.6%, 23.3%), greater willpower or self-motivation (19.6%, 15.4%), and support from a friend (8.9%, 6.5%). 3. The most commonly cited barriers for physical activity were lack of recreation facilities (18.6%, 15.8%), not enough sidewalks (9.9%, 8.7%), unattended dogs (8.4%, 8.1%), and no street lighting (7.7%, 9.0%). 4. The most commonly cited enablers were building a fitness center nearby (33.5%, 34.6%), providing better street lighting (10.1%, 10.3%), nearby organized exercise groups (11.0%, 6.8%), and more sidewalks (8.7%, 7.2%). 5. There was a statistically significant relationship between seeing people exercise in the neighborhood and (1) having insufficient or recommended levels of physical activity (versus being inactive) (OR=1.63, CI= 1.07-2.48) or (2) meeting recommendations (OR=1.57, CI= 1.16-2.12). 6. Women reporting lower social role strain (social roles score) were more likely to meet recommendations than women with high strain. (mean= 2.93 +/- 0.41, OR=1.49, CI=1.06 – 2.10).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Voorhees, Young (2003) Virginia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Urban, Female, Hispanic, Adults (target sample) 31.9 years old [mean age], 44.0% Spanish speaking only (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime 2. Access to place for physical activity within walking distance COMPLEX: 1. Neighborhood social support **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhoods in which women reported that unattended dogs were not a problem were less likely to be active (OR=0.91, 95% CI=0.54-1.54) and meet recommendations (OR=0.79; 95% CI, 0.44–1.41). 2. Women who perceived their neighborhood as safe from crime (either extremely or somewhat safe) were also more likely to be active (OR=1.34, 95% CI=0.81-2.20) and meet recommendations (OR=1.69; 95% CI, 0.82–3.47). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Women who reported having places within walking distance were less likely to be active (OR=0.87; 95% CI= 0.31–2.44) and meet activity recommendations (OR=1.58, 95% CI= 0.64-3.90). 2. Women who reported having places to exercise in their neighborhood were less likely to meet activity recommendations (OR=0.56, 95% CI= 0.27-1.17) and be active (OR=0.54; 95% CI= 0.26–1.11).	1. Women were significantly less likely to be active if they reported knowing people who exercised (meets recommendations; OR=0.49, 95% CI=0.27-0.89, any activity; OR=0.42; 95% CI= 0.23–0.76), if they reported people in their neighborhood exercised ([meets recommendations: OR=0.16, 95% CI=0.06-0.45, any activity: OR=0.19; 95% CI= 0.09–0.42), if they belonged to community groups (meets recommendations: OR=0.67, 95% CI=0.39-1.15, any activity: OR=0.32, 95% CI= 0.15–0.69), or if they attended religious services (meets recommendations: OR=0.60, 95% CI=0.31-1.13, any activity: OR=0.41; 95% CI= 0.41–0.72).
Author Hooker, Wilson (2005) South Carolina	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, Rural (target sample) 18-96 years old, 41% African-American, 59% White, >60% Overweight or obese, >59% not meeting activity recommendations (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime and unattended dogs COMPLEX: 1. Social environment (neighborhood trust) **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. White adults who reported their neighborhoods as safe were 1.8 times (95% CI= 1.03–3.12, $p < 0.05$), more likely to report meeting the walking recommendation than white adults who reported their neighborhoods as not safe.	1. There were no significant differences in perceptions of social and safety-related environmental supports between African American adults reporting meeting or not meeting physical activity recommendations. 2. There were no significant differences in perceptions of social and safety related environmental supports between African American adults reporting meeting or not meeting walking recommendations. 3. African American adults reporting that their neighbors were physically active were 2 times more likely to meet physical activity recommendations (OR=1.96, 95% CI=1.19-3.25, p=0.009). 4. White adults reporting that their neighbors were physically active were 2.5 times more likely to walk for at least 150 minutes per week (OR=2.51, 95% CI=1.54-4.08).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Suminski, Poston (2005) Midwestern USA	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 89.7% White, 1.7% Hispanic, 1.5% African American, and 1.3% Asian American (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime 2. Access to parks 3. Access to shops 4. Neighborhood aesthetics **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Women were 4.5 times more likely to walk for exercise in their neighborhood if neighborhood safety was average compared to below average (95%CI 1.01-20.72; p<0.05). 2. Women were more likely (threefold) to walk their dog if neighborhood safety was average versus below average (95% CI 1.01-11.08; p<0.05). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Women were 5.7 times more likely to walk for transportation if they indicated having an average number of available places in and around their neighborhood to which they could walk (95%CI 1.63-19.73; p<0.01). 2. Women with an average number of neighborhood destinations were more likely to walk for transportation in the neighborhood (OR=5.7, 95%CI=1.63-19.73) than women with a below average number of neighborhood destinations (p<0.01). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Men were less likely to walk for transportation in the neighborhood if the functional (OR=0.22, 95%CI=0.06-0.89) features of the neighborhood were average versus below average (p<0.05). 2. Women were 5.7 times more likely to walk for transportation if they indicated having an average number of available places in and around their neighborhood to which they could walk (95%CI 1.63-19.73; p<0.01). 3. Women with an average number of neighborhood destinations were more likely to walk for transportation in the neighborhood (OR=5.7, 95%CI=1.63-19.73) than women with a below average number of neighborhood destinations (p<0.01). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Men were less likely to walk for transportation in the neighborhood if the aesthetic (OR=0.17, 95%CI=0.03-0.89) features of the neighborhood were average versus below average (p<0.05). 2. For men, environmental features were not associated with walking the dog or for exercise. However, inverse relationships between walking for transportation and environmental features were noted in men. (Note: Neighborhood safety was a composite score using traffic volume and speed, lighting, and crime. Destinations included shops, parks, work, or schools. All areas of the questionnaire were included in the environment score.)	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Troped, Saunders (2003) Massachusetts	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. General population 18 years and older, 51.2 ± 16.8 years of age (average), 93.6% White (evaluation sample) Arlington is a Boston suburb with a mostly well educated (40.4% college degree), Caucasian population (93.9%). The town has a substantial older population with about 18% of residents aged 65 years and older.	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of heavy traffic in the neighborhood MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Presence of sidewalks and street connectivity 2. Land-use mix **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Participants who reported sidewalks in their neighborhood reported a higher level of participation in recreational physical activity (mean[sd]: sidewalks = 138.3[94.4] $p \leq 0.01$). 2. Presence of sidewalks did not show statistically significant independent associations with recreational physical activity. 3. Presence of streetlights (coefficient= 42.07, $p \leq 0.05$) and neighborhood sidewalks (coefficient= 47.75, $p < 0.05$) were positively associated with minutes of transportation physical activity. 4. Participants responding "yes" to having sidewalks (151.1[185.2], $p < 0.05$) had higher levels of transportation physical activity. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Participants responding "yes" to having enjoyable scenery in the neighborhood (152.7[189.0], $p < 0.005$) had higher levels of transportation physical activity. 2. Distance to a community paved rail-trail showed a negative association with transportation physical activity (coefficient= -54.65, $p \leq 0.05$). 3. Enjoyable scenery did not show statistically significant independent associations with recreational physical activity. 4. Enjoyable scenery (coefficient; 48.94, p=0.03) was positively associated with minutes of transportation physical activity.	1. Participants responding "yes" to seeing people exercising (mean[sd]: 148.1[185.6], $p < 0.005$), had higher levels of transportation physical activity. 2. In one final model only self-efficacy and self-report of enjoyable neighborhood scenery (coefficient; 59.63, $p \leq 0.01$) remained statistically significant.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Franzini, Elliot (2009) United States	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-10 year olds, 76% Minority, 30% Hispanic, 38% Black, 55% Female, 41% Overweight, most lived in urban areas (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Differences in residential density 2. Physical disorder in the neighborhood COMPLEX: 1. Social support **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The structural model for the ordinal measure of child obesity (underweight or normal weight, overweight, obese) suggested that neighborhood physical environment had no significant association with activity levels. **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The structural model for the ordinal measure of child obesity (underweight or normal weight, overweight, obese) suggested that neighborhood physical environment had no significant association with activity levels. (Note: Neighborhood physical environment was comprised of variables for traffic, density, land-use mix, and physical disorder.)	1. The structural model for ordinal measure of child obesity suggested that a favorable social environment was positively associated with physical activity (standardized regression coefficient = 0.13, $p<0.05$), which was negatively associated with child obesity (standardized regression coefficient = -0.24, $p<0.05$). 2. A favorable neighborhood social environment was positively associated with overall physical activity ($\beta=0.15$, $t=2.35$), days of vigorous exercise ($\beta= 0.57$, $t=2.90$), days with physical education in school ($\beta=0.39$, $t=4.18$), and favoring free-time movement activities ($\beta= 0.19$, $t=3.16$) (all $p<0.05$).
Author Sanderson, Foushee (2003) Alabama	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Rural, Female, Adults, 20-50 years old, 75-77% African American (evaluation sample) The data was collected from a predominately impoverished rural area.	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of safety from crime 2. Access to places for physical activity 3. Access to neighborhood destinations within walking distance 4. Presence or absence of sidewalks COMPLEX: 1. Neighborhood social support and self-efficacy **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environment variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environment variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environment variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. 2. Women reporting good lighting at night were less likely (OR=0.48, 95% CI= 0.27-0.88) to report any physical activity. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environment variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. (Note: Environmental variables include a composite score of distance to places to walk, safety from crime, street lighting, unttended dogs, presence of sidewalks, and traffic safety. Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. Women meeting recommendations (n=221) compared to women who did not (n=346) were more than twice as likely to see people exercising in the neighborhood (87.2%, OR=2.02, CI= 1.08-3.77) and to attend religious services (84.9%, OR= 2.10, CI= 1.21-3.65) 2. Women who reported any activity (n=481) compared with inactive women (n=86) were more likely to know people who exercise, have higher social issue scores (OR=1.29, 95% CI=1.11-1.49), and were more than 3 times as likely to report attending religious services (OR=3.83, 95% CI= 2.16-6.75).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Motl, Dishman (2005) South Carolina	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 13.6 ± 0.6 years (mean age), Female, 40.6% African-American, 38.9% Caucasian, 3% Other, 17.5% not reporting racial composition (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Neighborhood perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety and crime 2. Access to local parks, playgrounds and gyms. **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. With the baseline data, there was a statistically significant relationship from equipment accessibility to physical activity (gamma=0.33). 2. The path between the same latent variables across time (i.e., stability coefficients) was statistically significant for equipment accessibility (gamma=0.42). There were statistically significant correlations among the environmental variables at baseline (phi=0.50). 3. With the baseline data, there was a statistically significant relationship from equipment accessibility to self-efficacy (gamma=0.64). There was a statistically significant relationship from self-efficacy to physical activity (beta=0.35), but not from equipment accessibility to physical activity (gamma=0.13) or neighborhood safety to physical activity (gamma =0.01). Hence, self-efficacy mediated the effect of equipment accessibility on physical activity (indirect effect=0.22) in the baseline data. **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. With the baseline data, there was not a statistically significant relationship from neighborhood safety to physical activity (gamma=-0.03). 2. The path between the same latent variables across time (i.e., stability coefficients) was statistically significant for neighborhood safety (gamma=0.59) and physical activity (beta=0.46). There were statistically significant correlations among the environmental variables at baseline (phi=0.50). 3. With the baseline data, there was not a statistically significant relationship from neighborhood safety to self-efficacy (gamma=-0.14). There was a statistically significant relationship from self-efficacy to physical activity (beta=0.35), but not from equipment accessibility to physical activity (gamma=0.13) or neighborhood safety to physical activity (gamma =0.01). Hence, self-efficacy mediated the effect of equipment accessibility on physical activity (indirect effect=0.22) in the baseline data. (Note: Neighborhood safety included safety from unattended dogs, gangs, crime, traffic safety, and presence of sidewalks. Equipment accessibility included access to sports equipment at home, such as balls and skates, as well as access to parks, playgrounds and facilities.)	1. With the baseline data, there was a statistically significant relationship from equipment accessibility to self-efficacy (gamma=0.64), but not from neighborhood safety to self-efficacy (gamma=-0.14). 2. There was a statistically significant relationship from self-efficacy to physical activity (beta=0.35), but not from equipment accessibility to physical activity (gamma=0.13) or neighborhood safety to physical activity (gamma =0.01). Hence, self-efficacy mediated the effect of equipment accessibility on physical activity (indirect effect=0.22) in the baseline data.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
International						
Author Morrison, Thompson (2004) Scotland	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Participation = Not reported Exposure = High Participants were two-thirds women and older than the local population. **High-Risk Population** High The traffic calming scheme was built in the main road bisecting a deprived urban housing estate in Glasgow, Scotland. (lower-income)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** More Evidence Needed Exposure = High Representativeness = Not reported **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** More Evidence Needed High-risk population = High Representativeness = Not reported	**Intervention Components** Simple A traffic calming scheme comprised of 5 sets of speed cushions (raised platforms on the road to slow cars), two zebra crossings with adjacent railings, and parking bays was constructed **Feasibility** Intervention feasibility = High Policy feasibility = High Intervention Activities: Construction of traffic calming scheme. Specialized Expertise: Not reported Resources: Labor and materials for construction Costs = Not reported **Implementation Complexity** Low Intervention components = Simple Feasibility = High	**Population Impact** More Evidence Needed Effectiveness = Not reported for general population Potential population reach = More evidence needed Implementation complexity = Simple **High-risk Population Impact** More Evidence Needed Effectiveness high-risk populations = Net positive for physical activity for lower-income individuals Potential high-risk population reach = More evidence needed Implementation complexity = Simple **Sustainability** Not Reported	Not Reported	1. From the 1st to the 2nd surveys, residents perceived speeding traffic (z=-2.72, p=0.007), road safety for cyclists (z=-0.24, p<0.025), road safety for motorists (z=-3.60, p<0.000), crossing the road (z=-2.19, p=0.029), general facilities for pedestrians (z=-2.60, p<0.009), facilities for teens/ young people (z=-3.28, p=0.001) and drug dealing and drug taking (z=-4.39, p<0.001) to be less of a problem after the traffic calming scheme was built. 2. Based on the SF-36v2, there was a rise in the physical component summary scores between the 1st and 2nd surveys indicating that there was a statistically significant improvement in physical health status. Men had a 10.7 point difference in scores (from 31.3 to 42; 95%CI: 7-14.5), while women had a 7.5 difference in scores (from 33.2 to 40.7; 95%CI: 4.7-10.21). 3. Physical health status was not significantly different among those who did and did not report walking more as a result of the traffic calming scheme.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Giles-Corti, Donovan (2002); Giles-Corti, Donovan (2002); Giles-Corti, Donovan (2003); Giles-Corti, Macintyre (2003); McCormack, Giles-Corti (2007); McCormack, Giles-Corti (2008) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 18-59 years old (evaluation sample) The sample was comprised of relatively young, healthy, sedentary workers and homemakers living in high or low SES areas.	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to transit stations 2. Access to destinations, land-use, road network distance 3. Access to sidewalks 4. Access to recreation destinations 5. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Obese individuals were nearly twice as likely as others to perceive that there was no shop within walking distance (OR=1.84, 95%CI: 1.01-3.36). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Residing within 1500 meters (m) of destinations including schools (OR=1.75, 95% CI: 1.28-2.39, p<0.001), convenience stores (OR=1.89, 95% CI: 1.26-2.84, p<0.001), shopping malls (OR=2.07, 95% CI: 1.43-3.00, p<0.001), newsagents (OR=2.20, 95% CI: 1.60-3.03, p<0.001) was significantly associated with regular walking for transport. 3. For each additional type of destination (including recreational and utilitarian destinations) within 400 and 1500 m, the odds of regular walking for transport increased by 43% (95% CI: 1.27-1.61, p<0.001) and 41% (95% CI: 1.26-1.58, p<0.001) and the odds of irregular walking for transport increased by 27% (95% CI: 1.12-1.44, p<0.001) and 23% (95% CI: 1.12-1.35, p<0.001). 4. For each additional type of destination located within 1500 m the odds of regular walking for recreation increased by 16% (95% CI: 1.06-1.27, p<0.01), while the odds of irregular walking increased by 12% (95% CI: 1.01-1.26, p<0.05). 5. The mix of utilitarian destinations within 1500 m was positively associated with regular walking for recreation (OR=1.17, 95% CI: 1.05-1.29, p<0.01). 6. Destination mix was not associated with time spent walking for recreation or vigorous physical activity. 7. In comparison with those who had no sidewalk and no shop on their street, those who had access to either or both of these attributes were about 25% more likely to achieve recommended levels of walking (combined OR=1.25, 95% CI: 0.90-1.74). 8. Among individuals who frequented pay for use recreational destinations, each additional pay destination (OR=1.51, 95%CI: 1.32-1.73, p<0.001) was associated with the use of pay-destinations located in the neighborhood. 9. Respondents were more likely to walk for transport if they had a shop within walking distance (OR=3, 95%CI: 2.04-4.4, p<0.001). 10. Respondents were more likely to walk for transport if they were in the top quartile for access to attractive public open space (OR=1.35, 95%CI: 1.05-1.73, p=0.02). **Street Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Overweight individuals were more likely to live on streets with no sidewalks (OR=1.4, 95%CI: 1.01-1.95), streets with sidewalks on one side only (OR=1.32; 95%CI: 0.98-1.79), and perceive no paths within walking distance (OR=1.42; 95% CI: 1.08-1.86). *(continued next page)*	1. Walking at recommended levels was significantly associated with perceived behavioral control, frequency of a behavioral skill used in past month, intention to be active (high vs. low, OR=1.83, 95%CI: 1.14-2.94, p=0.13), having a club membership (OR=0.53, 95%CI: 0.39-0.74, p<0.01), owning a dog (OR=1.58, 95%CI: 1.19=2.09), social support for physical activity in the past 3 months, and being in the top quartile of access to attractive public open space (OR=1.47, 95%CI: 1-2.15, p=0.048). 2. Those who always had access to a motor vehicle were about half as likely to be obese as those who never had access to a motor vehicle (OR=0.56, 95%CI: 0.32-0.99). 3. Relative to respondents in the lowest determinant score categories, the odds of achieving recommended levels of walking were 3.1 times higher among those in the high individual determinant score category (95%CI: 2.2-4.37, p<0.001), 2.79 times higher among those in the high social environmental determinant score category (95%CI: 2-3.9, p<0.001), and 2.13 times higher among those in the high physical environmental determinant score category (95%CI: 1.54-2.94, p<0.001). 4. The greater the number of significant others who exercised weekly with the respondent, the more likely recommended levels of activity were achieved (four or more vs. none, OR=1.37, 95%CI: 0.83-2.25, test for trend p<0.001). 5. Those who used a pay destination located within or outside (OR=8.46, 95%CI: 3.98-18.00, p<0.001 and OR=3.48, 95%CI: 2.59-4.66, p<0.001, respectively) the neighborhood were more likely than those who did not use a pay destination to achieve sufficient vigorous-intensity physical activity. 6. Respondents using free destinations within and outside (OR=1.56, 95%CI: 1.00-2.33, p<0.05 and OR=2.13, 95%CI: 1.56-2.89, p<0.001, respectively) the neighborhood were more likely to achieve sufficient levels of vigorous-intensity physical activity than those not using a free recreational destination. 7. The likelihood of walking for recreation was higher in residents who perceived that there was support for walking locally (OR=1.8, 95%CI: 1.36-2.4, p<0.001) 8. Respondents were more likely to walk as recommended if they perceived their neighborhood as being supportive of walking locally (OR=1.52, 95%CI: 1.09-2.11, p=0.014).

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY:

2. In comparison with those who had no sidewalk and no shop on their street, those who had access to either or both of these attributes were about 25% more likely to achieve recommended levels of walking (combined OR=1.25, 95%CI: 0.90-1.74).
3. Respondents were more likely to walk for transport if they perceived that their neighborhood had sidewalks (OR=1.65, 95%CI: 1.12-2.41, p=0.011).
4. The likelihood of walking for recreation was higher in residents who perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe and interesting (OR=1.49, 95%CI: 1.14-1.95, p=0.003).
5. Respondents were more likely to walk as recommended if they perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.50, 95%CI: 1.08-2.09, p=0.017).
6. Those who exercised vigorously perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.39, 95%CI: 1.08-1.79; p=0.01) and claimed that there were sidewalks in the neighborhood (OR=1.52, 95%CI: 1.05-2.21, p=0.027).
7. Respondents were more likely to walk for transport if they had a shop within walking distance (OR=3, 95%CI: 2.04-4.4, p<0.001).

Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers

OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY:

1. Overweight individuals were more likely to perceive no paths within walking distance (OR=1.42; 95% CI: 1.08-1.86).

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY:

2. Having a beach within 1500 m was positively associated with irregular walking for recreation (OR=1.97, 95% CI: 1.01-3.83, p<0.05) and regular vigorous physical activity (OR=1.93, 95% CI: 1.20-3.13, p<0.01).
3. Among individuals who frequented pay for use recreational destinations, each additional pay destination (OR=1.51, 95%CI: 1.32-1.73, p<0.001) was associated with the use of pay-destinations located in the neighborhood.
4. Those who used a pay destination located within or outside (OR=8.46, 95%CI: 3.98-18.00, p<0.001 and OR=3.48, 95%CI: 2.59-4.66, p<0.001, respectively) the neighborhood were more likely than those who did not use a pay destination to achieve sufficient vigorous-intensity physical activity.
5. Respondents using free destinations within and outside (OR=1.56, 95%CI: 1.00-2.33, p<0.05 and OR=2.13, 95%CI: 1.56-2.89, p<0.001, respectively) the neighborhood were more likely to achieve sufficient levels of vigorous-intensity physical activity than those not using a free recreational destination.
6. The likelihood of walking for recreation was higher in residents in the top quartile of access to the beach (OR=1.49, 95%CI: 1.14-1.93, p=0.003).
7. Respondents were more likely to walk as recommended if they were in top quartile of access to public open space (OR=1.43, 95%CI: 1.07-1.91, p=0.015).
8. Those who exercised vigorously were more likely to be in the top quartile of access to the beach (OR=1.38, 95%CI: 1.07-1.79, p=0.013).
9. Individuals with poor access to 4 or more recreational facilities were 68% more likely to be obese compared with others (95%CI: 1.11-2.55).
10. Respondents were more likely to walk for transportation if they were in top quartile of access to public open space (OR=1.35, 95%CI: 1.05-1.73, p=0.02).

Safety-Interpersonal

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY:

1. The likelihood of walking for recreation was higher in residents who perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe and interesting (OR=1.49, 95%CI: 1.14-1.95, p=0.003).
2. Respondents were more likely to walk as recommended if they perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.50, 95%CI: 1.08-2.09, p=0.017).
3. Those who exercised vigorously were more likely perceive their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.39, 95%CI: 1.08-1.79; p=0.01).
4. The likelihood of walking for recreation was higher in residents that perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe and interesting (OR=1.49, 95%CI: 1.14-1.95, p=0.003).
5. Respondents were more likely to walk as recommended if they perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.50, 95%CI: 1.08-2.09, p=0.017).
6. Those who exercised vigorously were more likely to perceive their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.39, 95%CI: 1.08-1.79; p=0.01).

Transportation

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY:

1. Residing within 1500 m of transit stations (OR=2.38, 95% CI: 1.67-3.39, p<0.001) was significantly associated with regular walking for transport.
2. Having a transit station located within 1500 m was positively associated with regular walking for recreation (OR=1.50, 95% CI: 1.09-2.05, p<0.05).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Carver, Timperio (2008) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-18 year olds, no racial/ethnic demographics given. (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For children, there were no significant associations between parents' scores for road safety, incivilities, or personal safety of the child and MVPA during the specified periods. 2. A more positive parental perception of personal safety was associated with increased MVPA among boys after school (unadjusted: β=0.978, p=0.024).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author De Vries, Bakker (2007) The Netherlands	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 8.3 ± 1.4 year olds (mean), 6-11 years old (range)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to neighborhood recreation spaces 2. Intersection density and parking access 3. Land use mix and housing design COMPLEX: 1. Friendliness of neighborhood **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Children's physical activity was positively associated with the proportion of green space (β=0.865; 95% CI= -0.494, 2.225, p<0.05). 2. Children's physical activity was negatively associated with the frequency of paved playgrounds (β= -1.372; 95% CI= -2.549, -0.195, p<0.05). 3. No significant associations were found between children's physical activity levels and sports and recreation facilities, except for sports fields (β= 2.804, 95% CI= 1.555, 4.052, p<0.05). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Children's physical activity was also positively associated with the residential density (β=0.009; 95% CI= 0.001, 0.017, p<0.05). 2. Children's physical activity was positively associated with the frequency of terrace houses (β=1.508; 95% CI=0.726, 2.290) andblocks of flats with fewer than 6 stores (β=-1.472; 95%CI=-1.992, -0.953) in the neighborhood (p<0.05 for both). 3. Children's physical activity was negatively associated with the frequency of staircase entrance flats (3-4 stories without elevator) (β= -1.472; 95% CI= -1.992- -0.953, p<0.05) and unoccupied (boarded up) houses (β= -3.080; 95% CI= -4.625, -1.535, p<0.05). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Children's physical activity was also positively associated with the frequency of parallel parking spaces (β=2.152; 95%CI= 1.408, 2.897, p<0.05) and parking lots (β=3.169; 95% CI=2.055, 4.284, p<0.05) 2. Children's physical activity was negatively associated with intersections in the neighborhood (β= -1.035; 95% CI= -1.825, -0.246, p<0.05).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Carver, Salmon (2005) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 12-13 year olds, mean age 13.0 ±0.2 (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Neighborhood perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to sports facilities 2. Access to convenience stores 3. Neighborhood perceptions of safety from crime COMPLEX: 1. Social support **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Boys' worry about roaming dogs was negatively associated with frequency (β= -0.213, p<0.05) and duration (β= -0.194, p<0.05) of walking for exercise on weekdays, duration of walking for exercise on weekends (β= -0.189, p<0.05), and duration of walking for transport on weekdays (β=-0.159, p<0.05). 2. Girls' worry about roaming dogs was negatively associated with frequency (β= -0.164, p<0.01) and duration (β= -0.153, p<0.05) of cycling for recreation on weekends, frequency (β= -0.219, p<0.01) and duration (β= -0.183, p<0.05) of cycling for recreation on weekdays, and frequency of walking the dog on weekends (β= -0.138, p<0.05). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Girls' perception of convenience stores near home was negatively associated with frequency (β= -0.157, p<0.01) and duration (β= -0.15, p<0.01) of walking for transport on weekends. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Parents' perception that their neighborhood had good sports facilities for their child to use was positively associated with girls' frequency (β=0.115, p<0.01) and duration (β=0.092, p<0.05) of cycling for recreation of weekdays, girls' frequency of cycling for recreation on weekends (β=0.092, p<0.05), girls' frequency of walking the dog on weekends (β=0.123, p<0.05), and boys' frequency of cycling for transport on weekdays (β=0.155, p<0.05).	1. Boys' perception of having lots of boys/girls the same age to hang out with was positively associated with duration (β=0.27, p<0.01) and frequency (β=0.242, p<0.01) of cycling for recreation on weekdays, frequency of cycling for transport on weekdays (β=0.141, p<0.05), and duration of walking for transport weekdays (β=0.129, p<0.05). 2. Boys' perception of waving/talking to neighbors most days was positively associated with duration (β=0.108, <0.05) and frequency (β=0.149, p<0.05) of walking for transport on weekdays. 3. Girls' reports of waving/talking to neighbors most days were positively associated with frequency (β=0.119, p<0.05) and duration (β=0.103, p<0.01) of walking for transport on weekdays and frequency (β=0.16, p<0.01) and duration (β=0.156, p<0.01) of walking for exercise on weekdays. 4. Girls' perception of having many friends in the neighborhood was positively associated with frequency (β=0.078, p<0.05) and duration of walking (β=0.119, p<0.01) for transport on weekdays, frequency (β=0.193, p<0.01) and duration (β=0.189, p<0.01) of walking for transport on weekends, and frequency (β=0.211, p<0.01) and duration (β=0.23, p<0.01) of walking to school. 5. Girls' perception of having lots of boys/girls the same age to hang out with was positively associated with frequency (β=0.118, p<0.01) and duration (β=0.1, p<0.01) of walking to school and frequency of cycling for recreation on weekends (β=0.164, p<0.01). 6. Girls' perception of having friends close to home was positively associated with frequency of walking for transport on weekdays (β=0.069, p<0.05).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Harrison, Gemmell (2007) United Kingdom	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, 95.5% White, 4.5% Minority, 95.5% Male, mean age 49.8 years (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime and vandalism 2. Availability of leisure facilities (parks) **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. People who felt unsafe out and about in their neighborhood during the day (relative prevalence 0.70, 95% CI= 0.59 to 0.82) and during the night (relative prevalence 0.82, 95% CI=0.78 to 0.88) were significantly less likely to be defined as physically active compared with those who felt safe during these times. 2. There was no association among physical activity and people stating that vandalism, and assaults or muggings were a problem in their neighborhood, also not among people who had or not been victims of personal crime during the past year. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Persons reporting a place to walk were significantly more likely to meet current recommendations for regular physical activity (41.5%, 95% CI= 39.4%-43.6%) than were those reporting no place to walk (27.4%; 95% CI= 21.2%-33.7%). 2. There was a positive significant relationship between place to walk and meeting current activity recommendations (not home based: p=0.005; public park: p=0.02). The same direct pattern was seen for other specified places, but the trend was not significant.	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Lee, Kawakubo (2007) Japan	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, 56% Female (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime 2. Street connectivity (alternate routes to locations) and neighborhood aesthetics 3. Access to parks and trails **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In the safety category the variable, "The sidewalk is well-lit even at night", showed significantly higher scores in the high walkable region (high; mean [sd]; 2.97[1.32] vs. low; 2.11[1.42], p<0.01). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Those who had high scores for "There are sidewalks suitable for walking in the neighborhood" (high walkable: low perception mean [sd] 191.7[200.6] vs. high perception mean [sd] 302.9[279.7], p<0.05) (low walkable: low perception mean [sd] 125.9[182.1] vs. high perception mean [sd] 211.3[234.5], p<0.05) spent significantly more walking time in both regions. 2. In the low walkable region, those who had high scores for "There are several ways to get to one place" (low perception mean [sd]: 124.9[139.9] vs. high perception mean [sd]: 201.4[249.4], p<0.05), "It is easy to cross streets" (low perception mean [sd]: 145.1[162.7] vs. high perception mean [sd]: 214.6[270.2], p<0.05), "The sidewalks have few inclines and are easy to walk on" [low perception mean [sd]: 89.7[88.2] vs. high perception mean [sd]: 215.6[245.9], p<0.01) and "The sidewalks are wide enough to walk on" (low perception mean [sd]: 132.2[138.8] vs. high perception mean [sd]: 232.8[284.5], p<0.01) spent significantly more walking time. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In the high walkable region, those who had high scores for "There is a park nearby that is suitable for taking a walk in" (low perception mean [sd]: 190.8[195.0] vs. high perception mean [sd] 300.2[279.5], p<0.05), "There is a river (or a beach) within walking distance" low perception mean [sd]: 217.2[211.7] vs. high perception mean [sd] 299.1[283.6], p<0.05), and "The neighborhood is conducive for taking a walk" (low perception mean [sd]: 245.0[233.5] vs. high perception mean [sd] 323.4[308.5], p<0.05) spent significantly more walking time.	1. In the convenience category, the score for "The walking map of the neighborhood is useful" was significantly higher in the high walkable region (high; mean [sd]; 3.58[1.29], vs. low; 2.45[1.64], p<0.01). 2. Those who had high scores for "Residents in the neighborhood are friendly" spent significantly more walking time in both regions (high walkable: low perception mean [sd]: 234.2[212.2] vs. high perception mean [sd] 381.0[254.5], p<0.01) (low walkable: low perception mean [sd]: 135.9[157.1] vs. high perception mean [sd]: 228.3[271.0], p<0.05). 3. In the safety category, the score for "Vehicular traffic does not hinder taking a walk" was significantly higher in the low walkable region (high; mean [sd]; 2.49[1.48], vs. low; 3.08[1.55], p<0.01). 4. In the convenience category, the score for "The sidewalks are wide enough to walk on" was significantly higher in the low walkable region (high; mean [sd]; 2.54[1.50] vs. low; 3.04[1.50], p<0.01), whereas that for "The walking map of the neighborhood is useful" was significantly higher in the high walkable region (high; mean [sd]; 3.58[1.29], vs. low; 2.45[1.64], p<0.01).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Hume, Timperio (2009); Timperio, Crawford (2004) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. 5-18 year olds; mean age=9.1±0.3 years (younger children), mean age= 14.5±0.6 years (adolescents), 47% Male (2004 evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Neighborhood perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to sports facilities 2. Access to public transportation **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Baseline* 1. A lower likelihood of walking or cycling among older girls, was associated with child's belief that there were no parks or sports grounds near home (OR=0.5, 95% CI= 0.3, 0.8, p<0.01). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: *Baseline* 1. Five to six year old girls whose parents believed that public transport was limited in their area were 60% less likely (95% CI=0.2, 0.9, p<0.05) than other children to walk or cycle at least three times per week. 2. A lower likelihood of walking or cycling among older girls, was associated with parent's belief that there was limited public transport in the area (OR= 0.7, 95% CI=0.4, 0.97, p<0.05).	BASELINE: 1. Five to six year old girls whose parents owned more than one car and whose parents believed that public transport was limited in their area were 70% (95% CI=0.1, 0.8) and 60% less likely (95% CI=0.2, 0.9) than other children to walk or cycle at least three times per week (p<0.05 for both). FOLLOW-UP: 2. Active commuting significantly increased between 2004 and 2006 among children (Mean increase=1.04 trips/ week, SD=3.15, p=0.0004) and adolescents (mean increase=0.65 trips/week, SD=3.66, p=0.02). 3. Children whose parents knew many people in their neighborhood were more likely to increase their active commuting (OR=2.6, CI=1.2, 5.9; p=0.02) compared with other children.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Kondo, Lee (2009) Japan	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, 30-69 years old (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Residential density and land use mix-diversity 2. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 3. Street connectivity and aesthetics 4. Access to gymnasiums and fitness facilities **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There were no differences in mean walking time for transport or cycling time for transport related to neighborhood environment perception scores between the high and low scoring groups. 2. For men, there were no differences in walking steps between the high scoring group and the low scoring group for residential density, land use mix-diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, and safety. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There were no significant differences in walking steps related to land use type, length of streets or sidewalks, number of intersections, and width of streets between the high and low scoring groups. There were no differences in walking time for leisure or transport associated with objective neighborhood measures between the high and low scoring groups. 2. For males, there were no differences in walking steps between the high scoring group and the low scoring group for residential density, land use mix-diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, and safety. 3. For females, mean total walking steps was significantly higher in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the walking places score (mean± standard error: 9488±511 vs. 7957 ± 538; p<0.05). 4. For males, mean walking time for leisure was significantly longer in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the aesthetics score (mean ± standard error: 20.6 ± 6.0 vs. 0.6 ± 6.7; p<0.05). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For females, mean total walking steps was significantly higher in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the walking places score (mean± standard error: 9488±511 vs. 7957 ± 538; p<0.05). 2. For males, mean walking time for leisure was significantly longer in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for individuals with parks in the area compared to those without (26.2 ± 6.4 vs. 2.7 ± 6.9; p<0.05). 3. For males, mean cycling time for transport was significantly longer in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the number of land use types (mean ± standard error: 11.9 ± 3.0 vs. 0.8 ± 4.4; p<0.05)including gymnasiums/fitness facilities (31.9 ± 7.8 vs. 5.8 ± 2.5; p<0.01), and/or amusement facilities (16.4 ± 4.6 vs. 4.8 ± 3.0; p<0.05) in the area when compared to subjects without these facilities. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There were no significant differences in walking steps related to land use type, length of streets or sidewalks, number of intersections, and width of streets between the high and low scoring groups. 2. Mean total walking steps was significantly higher for subjects with bookstores (10568 ± 898 vs. 6983 ± 881; p<0.01) or rental video stores (10336 ± 962 vs. 7422 ± 873; p<0.05) in the area (within 10-minute walk) than for subjects without these facilities. 3. For females, mean cycling time for transport was significantly longer in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the number of land use types (mean ± standard error: 11.9 ± 3.0 vs. 0.8 ± 4.4; p<0.05) including gymnasiums/fitness facilities (31.9 ± 7.8 vs. 5.8 ± 2.5; p<0.01), and/or amusement facilities (16.4 ± 4.6 vs. 4.8 ± 3.0; p<0.05) in the area when compared to subjects without these facilities. 4. There were no differences in walking steps between the high scoring group and the low scoring group for residential density, land use mix-diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, and safety. 5. For females, mean total walking steps was significantly higher in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the walking places score (mean± standard error: 9488±511 vs. 7957 ± 538; p<0.05). (Note: Multiple GIS and perception measures were used to determine respondent's walkability score.)	1. For males, mean cycling time for transport was significantly longer in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the number of land use types (mean ± standard error: 11.9 ± 3.0 vs. 0.8 ± 4.4; p<0.05) including post offices (12.1 ± 3.1 vs. 1.5 ± 4.2; p<0.05), and banks/ credit unions (15.4 ± 3.8 vs. 3.1 ± 3.3; p<0.05) in the area when compared to subjects without these facilities. 2. For females, mean cycling time for transport was significantly longer in the high scoring group than in the low scoring group for the number of land use types (mean ± standard error: 11.9 ± 3.0 vs. 0.8 ± 4.4; p<0.05) including post offices (12.1 ± 3.1 vs. 1.5 ± 4.2; p<0.05), banks/ credit unions (15.4 ± 3.8 vs. 3.1 ± 3.3; p<0.05), gymnasiums/ fitness facilities (31.9 ± 7.8 vs. 5.8 ± 2.5; p<0.01), in the area when compared to subjects without these facilities.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Craig, Brownson (2002) Canada	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. General Population (target population) The observed neighborhoods were known for diversity of urban design, social class, and economic status.	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of safety from crime 2. Access to walkable routes for pedestrians and neighborhood aesthetics 3. Degree of neighborhood urbanization 4. Access to different transportation modes COMPLEX: 1. Social support in the environment **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The degree of urbanization altered the relationship between the environment score and walking to work (no statistical data). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Walking to work was significantly related to the environment score (T-ratio (25)=3.32, p=0.003), with a one-unit increase in the score being associated with a 25-percentage-point increase in the percentage walking to work. 2. The degree of urbanization altered the relationship between the environment score and walking to work (no statistical data). 3. The predicted environment score was lower in both small urban (T-ratio (23)=-3.61, p=0.002; Coefficient; -0.77) and suburban neighborhoods (T-ratio (23)=-4.42, p<0.001; Coefficient=-0.12) than in urban neighborhoods. 4. The environment score was related to the percentage walking to work, controlling for degree of urbanization (T-ratio (23)=2.03, p=0.054; Coefficient=0.02). **Safety Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The degree of urbanization altered the relationship between the environment score and walking to work (no statistical data). 2. The predicted environment score was lower in both small urban (T-ratio (23)=-3.61, p=0.002; Coefficient; -0.77) and suburban neighborhoods (T-ratio (23)=-4.42, p<0.001; Coefficient=-0.12) than in urban neighborhoods. 3. Walking to work was significantly related to the environment score (T-ratio (25)=3.32, p=0.003), with a one-unit increase in the score being associated with a 25-percentage-point increase in the percentage walking to work. 4. The environment score was related to the percentage walking to work, controlling for degree of urbanization (T-ratio (23)=2.03, p=0.054; Coefficient=0.02). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The environmental factor coefficients ranged from -1.82 to 2.20. Each factor was a significant contributor to the variation of the environment score (mean p=0.10 for "transportation system" and p<0.05 for other factors), except for visual interest and aesthetics. The inclusion of environmental factors (destinations, social dynamics, transportation system, and traffic) reduced the variation in the score by 46%. (Note: An environment score based on 18 neighborhood characteristics (e.g., variety of destinations, visual aesthetics, accessibility, transportation systems and safety from traffic and crime) was developed with a higher score indicating a more walkable environment.)	1. The environmental factor coefficients ranged from -1.82 to 2.20. Each factor was a significant contributor to the variation of the environment score (mean p=0.10 for "transportation system" and p<0.05 for other factors), except for visual interest and aesthetics. The inclusion of environmental factors (destinations, social dynamics, transportation system, and traffic) reduced the variation in the score by 46%. 2. The predicted environment score was lower in both small urban (T-ratio (23)=-3.61, p=0.002; Coefficient; -0.77) and suburban neighborhoods (T-ratio (23)=-4.42, p<0.001; Coefficient=-0.12) than in urban neighborhoods.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Carnegie, Bauman (2002) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. General population, Adults 40-60 years old, 57.4% Female (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety (dogs barking) 2. Land-use mix 3. Access to open spaces (beaches and parks) 4. Perceptions of the aesthetic environment COMPLEX: 1. Friendliness of neighborhood **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The "dogs barking" variable showed no relationship with walking activity nor did the "safety at night" question. 2. The "feel safe walking at night" question was much more of an issue for women than men (M=3.7 for women and 2.4 for men, p<0.001), showing that women felt much less safe than men walking at night. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There was an independent association between the stage of change variable and the aesthetic environment (F (2, 1.168) = 5.67; p<0.01) and with the practical environment factor (F (2, 1.157) =12.05; p<0.001). 2. Those who walked for less than 20 minutes and those who walked for between 20 minutes and 2 hours both reported that shops, parks, and beaches were less near to their home than those who reported walking more than 2 hours per week (F (2, 1.168) = 11.24, p<0.001). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Those who walked for less than 20 minutes and those who walked for between 20 minutes and 2 hours both reported that shops, parks, and beaches were less near to their home than those who reported walking more than 2 hours per week (F (2, 1.168) = 11.24, p<0.001). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There was an independent association between the stage of change variable and the aesthetic environment (F (2, 1.168) = 5.67; p<0.01) and with the practical environment factor (F (2, 1.157) =12.05; p<0.001). 2. Those who did little walking (20 min utesor less per week) reported more negative perceptions of their aesthetic environment than those who reported walking for between 20 minutes and 2 hours and those who reported walking for more than 2 hours (F (2, 1.163)= 5.19, p<0.01).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Timperio, Salmon (2005) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-6 year olds, 10-12 year olds	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Safety from traffic **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	1. Compared to parents of older children, greater proportions of parents of younger children reported concern about stranger danger (98.3% vs. 91%, p<0.001), road safety (93.8% vs. 88.7%, p=0.012), lack of street lights or crossing for their child to use (58.3% vs. 49.1%, p=0.006), and the necessity to cross several roads to access play areas (54.3% vs. 43.4%, p=0.001). 2. Compared to parents of children aged 5-6 years, greater proportions of parents of children aged 10-12 years perceived that their child had access to school (84% vs. 74.7%, p<0.001), bicycle or walking tracks (86.7% vs. 80.6%, p=0.012), friend's houses (88.4% vs. 79.4%, p<0.001), shops (92.1% vs. 83.2%, p<0.001) and sports venues (61.5% vs. 50.0%, p=0.001) within walking distance of home. 3. Compared to parents of children aged 5-6 years, greater proportions of parents of children aged 10-12 years perceived that their child had access to school (84% vs. 74.7%, p<0.001), bicycle or walking tracks (86.7% vs. 80.6%, p=0.012), friend's houses (88.4% vs. 79.4%, p<0.001), shops (92.1% vs. 83.2%, p<0.001) and sports venues (61.5% vs. 50.0%, p=0.001) within walking distance of home.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Humpel, Owen (2004); Humpel, Marshall (2004) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. General Population (target Sample) Ages ranged from 18 to 71 years of age (mean age 43 years), 49.8% women (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Accessibility of paths, parks, and other walking opportunities 2. Perceptions of access to neighborhood stores 3. Perceptions of access to transit 4. Neighborhood aesthetics **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Men with the highest scores for convenience (OR=2.20, 95% CI=2.21-3.99, p<0.01) were more likely to walk in their neighborhood than individuals with lower scores. 2. Women with moderate convenience scores(OR=3.19, 95% CI=1.81-5.59, p<0.001) were more likely to report higher levels of walking and higher total physical activity. 3. Women with increased perceptions of convenience were twice as likely to report increased walking (any increase; OR=2.58; 95%CI=1.46-4.56, p<0.001, increase of 30 minutes or more; OR=2.31, 95% CI= 1.29-4.14, p<0.01, increase of 60 minutes or more; OR=2.01, 95%CI= 1.09-3.70, p<0.05) compared to those who did not positively change perceptions. 4. Participants with low baseline convenience scores reported a mean relative change increase of 0.79 (SD=0.87) and those with high baseline scores reported a relative change decrease of -0.21 (SD=0.22). 5. Participants with low baseline convenience scores reported a mean relative change increase of 0.79 (SD=0.87), and those with high scores reported a relative change decrease of -0.21 (SD=0.22). 6. Men with a high convenience score were 1.82 times more likely to engage in total physical activity than those with a lower score (95%CI= 1.02-3.24, p<0.05). 7. Men who increased their perception of convenience (OR=1.95, 95% CI=1.10-3.45, p<0.05) were more likely to have increased walking and twice as likely to have increased walking more than 30 minutes (convenience; OR=2.02, 95% CI=1.12-3.65, p<0.05) compared to men with no perception change. Men with increased perceptions of convenience were also 1.98 (95%CI 1.08-3.61; p<0.05) times more likely to have increased their walking to more than 60 minutes. 8. Women with a high convenience scores were 3.78 times more likely (95% CI=2.12-6.73, p<0.001) to report the highest levels of neighborhood walking in the neighborhood when compared to those with low scores. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Men with high scores for access (OR=1.98, 95%CI=1.12-3.49, p<0.05) were more likely to walk in their neighborhood than individuals with lower scores. 2. Women with moderate access (OR=1.92, 95% CI=1.10-3.37, p<0.05) were more likely to report higher levels of walking and higher total physical activity. Women with high access scores were 52% less likely (OR=0.48, 95% CI=0.27-0.87, p<0.05) to walk in the neighborhood when compared to those with low scores. 3. Women with high access scores were 52% less likely (OR=0.48, 95% CI=0.27-0.87, p<0.05) to walk in the neighborhood when compared to those with low scores. **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Men with moderate access (OR=1.98, 95CI=1.12-3.49, p<0.05) were more likely to walk in their neighborhood than individuals with lower scores. 2. Women with moderate access (OR=1.92, 95% CI=1,10-3.37, p<0.05) were more likely to report higher levels of walking and higher total physical activity, respectively. 3. Women with high access scores were 52% less likely (OR=0.48, 95% CI=0.27-0.87, p<0.05) to walk in the neighborhood when compared to those with low scores. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Men with moderate (OR=1.77, 95% CI=1.06-2.97, p<0.05) and high aesthetic scores (OR=1.91, 95% CI=1.08-3.37, p<0.05) were more likely to walk in their neighborhood than individuals with lower scores. 2. Men who increased their perception of aesthetics (OR=2.25, 95% CI= 1.24-4.05, p<0.01) were more likely to have increased walking and twice as likely to have increased walking more than 30 minutes (aesthetics; OR=2.0, 95%CI=1.12-3.79, p<0.05) compared to men with no perception change. (Note: The composite score for access was comprised of access to shops and public transit. Convenience scores were a composite of the accessibility of paths, parks, and other walking opportunities.)	1. Participants with low initial access scores reported a mean relative change increase of 0.35 (SD=2.14), and a decrease score of -0.24 (SD=0.24) was reported for those with an initial high score. 2. Participants with a low aesthetic scores at baseline reported a mean relative increase of 0.42 (SD=0.46), whereas those with a high initial scores reported a decrease, with a relative change score of -0.16 (SD=0.18). 3. Participants with low baseline convenience scores reported a mean relative change increase of 0.79 (SD=0.87) and those with high baseline scores reported a relative change decrease of -0.21 (SD=0.22). 4. Participants with low aesthetic scores at baseline reported a mean relative change increase of 0.42 (SD=0.46), whereas those with high scores reported a decrease, with a relative change of -0.16 (SD=0.16). 5. Participants with low baseline convenience scores reported a mean relative change increase of 0.79 (SD=0.87), and those with high scores reported a relative change decrease of -0.21 (SD=0.22). 6. Participants with low baseline scores for traffic as a problem reported a relative change increase of 1.13 (SD=1.83), whereas those with high initial scores reported a decrease of -0.2 (SD=0.22).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Burton, Turrell (2005) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 18-64 years old	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Neighborhood aesthetics 2. Access to places for physical activity 3. Access to streetlights (safety) 4. Access to public transit COMPLEX: 1. Social support in the neighborhood 2. Self-efficacy for physical activity **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Environmental variables contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity (no results shown). 2. The proportion of unique variation (Nagelkerke R^2) accounted for in walking, moderate-intensity, vigorous-intensity activity, and total physical activity by the environmental correlate group is 0.6, 1.1, 0.4, and 1.2, respectively. 3. Neighborhood aesthetics contributed more to walking (Nagelkerke R^2=0.4%), and the barrier of family obligations contributed more to total and moderate-intensity activity. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Environmental variables contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity (no results shown). **Safety Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Environmental variables contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity (no results shown). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Environmental variables contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity (no results shown). (Note: The environmental scale was developed from a battery of items, which led to the inclusion of multiple strategies. Environmental variables include footpaths [sidewalks], public transport, street lighting, perceived safety, busyness of streets and traffic flow, facilities for activity, cleanliness, and friendliness.)	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Hume, Salmon (2007) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 10-year-olds, Low-income; 49% boys (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to neighborhood destinations 2. Perceptions of neighborhood safety 3. Street connectivity COMPLEX: 1. Social support (presence of friends in the area) **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Among boys, access to the total number of neighborhood destinations (0.35, p=0.03) was positively associated with weekly walking frequency. Total number of accessible destinations score remained significantly positively associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (p<0.05). **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Among boys, perceiving that it was a safe neighborhood to walk/cycle to school (β=-1.92, p=0.07) was positively associated with weekly walking frequency. 2. Among girls, the perceptions of lots of neighborhood graffiti (β=2.59, p=0.04) and safety in the neighborhood for walking/cycling to school (β=2.78, p=0.03) were significantly positively associated with walking frequency. Lots of graffiti remained significantly associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (both p<0.05). 3. Perceiving lots of litter and rubbish in the neighborhood (β=51.28, p=0.02) was significantly associated with overall physical activity among boys. 4. For boys' overall physical activity, having friends living in walking/cycling distance and presence of lots of litter (both p<0.05) remained significantly positively associated in the multiple regression model. 5.Chi square analyses showed that significantly more boys than girls reported access to a walking or cycling track in their neighborhood (94% vs. 85%; $\chi^2[1]=5.59$, p=0.02), lots of graffiti (27% vs. 15%; $\chi^2[1]=5.34$, p=0.02), that it is safe to walk or cycle to school (71% vs. 56%; $\chi^2[1]=5.79$, p=0.02), and that they knew all their neighbors quite well (73% vs. 61%; $\chi^2[1]=3.86$, p=0.05). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Among girls, the perceptions of nice houses in the neighborhood (β=2.98, p=0.003); lots of neighborhood graffiti (β=2.59, p=0.04); nice neighborhood house gardens (β=1.91, p=0.03); having an easily walkable/cyclable neighborhood (β=2,75, p=0.0001) was significantly positively associated with walking frequency. Easy to walk/cycle and lots of graffiti remained significantly associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (both p<0.05).	1. Among boys, knowing their neighbors well (β=2.13, p=0.04) was positively associated with weekly walking frequency. Total number of accessible destinations score remained significantly positively associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (p<0.05). 2. Among girls, knowing lots of people in the area (β=2.61, p=0.05); and having lots of friends in the area (p=0.08) were significantly positively associated with walking frequency. Easy to walk/cycle and lots of graffiti remained significantly associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (both p<0.05). 3. Perceiving lots of children in the neighborhood to play with (β=110.51, p=0.03), friends within walking/cycling distance of home (β=104.79, p= 0.04), and the overall neighborhood social environment scale (β=31.68, p=0.006) were significantly associated with overall physical activity among boys. 4. For boys' overall physical activity, having friends living in walking/cycling distance and presence of lots of litter (both p<0.05) remained significantly positively associated in the multiple regression model. 5. Chi square analyses showed that significantly more boys than girls reported access to a walking or cycling track in their neighborhood (94% vs. 85%; $\chi^2[1]=5.59$, p=0.02), lots of graffiti (27% vs. 15%; $\chi^2[1]=5.34$, p=0.02), that it is safe to walk or cycle to school (71% vs. 56%; $\chi^2[1]=5.79$, p=0.02), and that they knew all their neighbors quite well (73% vs. 61%; $\chi^2[1]=3.86$, p=0.05). 6. Chi square analyses showed that significantly more boys than girls reported access to a walking or cycling track in their neighborhood (94% vs. 85%; $\chi^2[1]=5.59$, p=0.02), lots of graffiti (27% vs. 15%; $\chi^2[1]=5.34$, p=0.02), that it is safe to walk or cycle to school (71% vs. 56%; $\chi^2[1]=5.79$, p=0.02), and that they knew all their neighbors quite well (73% vs. 61%; $\chi^2[1]=3.86$, p=0.05). In contrast, more girls than boys reported that they were worried about strangers in their neighborhood (45% vs. 30%; $\chi^2[1]=6.06$, p=0.01). 7. More girls than boys reported that they were worried about strangers in their neighborhood (45% vs. 30%; $\chi^2[1]=6.06$, p=0.01).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Panter, Jones (2008) England	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of traffic safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Residential density and neighborhood aesthetics 2. Access to indoor and outdoor facilities for physical activity 3. Street connectivity **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Participants that reported 5 sessions of activity per week lived closer to sports facilities (mean distance [standard error]=1479.9 [34.25] and mean walkability scores=44.46 [0.37]). 2. Individuals that reported 5 or more weekly aerobic activity sessions gave a higher neighborhood walkability score (mean=46.05 [0.48]) than individuals who did not (mean=43.79 {0.54]), although this association was not apparent when walking alone was considered (p<0.01). 3. Respondents rating their neighborhood as having intermediate or good walkability were over 3 times as likely to report 5 or more sessions of physical activity per week compared to those who gave the lowest rating (OR= 3.14, p=0.02; and OR= 3.04, p=0.03 respectively). 4. Those who lived in the closest tertile to a park or green space were over twice as likely to report five or more sessions of physical activity (OR=2.17, 95% CI= 1.00-4.78, p≤0.05). 5. None of the associations with access to leisure facilities were statistically significant and were generally in a contrary direction to that expected; those living nearest to the facilities generally reported lower levels of activity than those farther away. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Individuals that reported 5 or more weekly aerobic activity sessions gave a higher neighborhood walkability score (mean= 46.05 [0.48]) than individuals who did not (mean =43.79 [0.54]), although this association was not apparent when walking alone was considered (p<0.01). 2. Respondents rating their neighborhood as having intermediate or good walkability were over 3 times as likely to report 5 or more sessions of physical activity per week compared to those who gave the lowest rating (OR= 3.14, p=0.02; and OR= 3.04, p=0.03 respectively). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Participants that reported 5 sessions of activity per week, lived closer to sports facilities (mean distance [standard error] = 1268.9 [104.99], p<0.05) and had higher neighborhood walkability scores (mean= 48.10 [0.79], p<0.01) than their less active counterparts (mean distance= 1479.9 [34.25] and mean walkability scores= 44.46 [0.37]). 2. Individuals that reported 5 or more weekly aerobic activity sessions gave a higher neighborhood walkability score (mean= 46.05 [0.48]) than individuals who did not (mean=43.79 [0.54]), although this association was not apparent when walking alone was considered (p<0.01). 3. Respondents rating their neighborhood as having intermediate or good walkability were over 3 times as likely to report 5 or more sessions of physical activity per week compared to those who gave the lowest rating (OR= 3.14, p=0.02; and OR= 3.04, p=0.03 respectively). 4. Those who lived in the closest tertile to a park or green space were over twice as likely to report five or more sessions of physical activity (OR=2.17, 95% CI= 1.00-4.78, p≤0.05). 5. None of the associations with access to leisure facilities were statistically significant and were generally in a contrary direction to that expected; those living nearest to the facilities generally reported lower levels of activity than those farther away. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	Not Reported