IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS TABLE 43

Safety Interpersonal

EFFECTIVENESS TABLES

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
United States				
Author Cohen, McKenzie (2007) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Active neighborhoods* (access to parks and quality and safety of parks) **Outcome(s) Affected** Total energy expended (METs), leisure exercising, and physical activity (System for Observing Play and recreation in Communities [SOPARC]) and urban park use (interviews)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased accessibility, safety and quality of parks leads to increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Concerns about park safety were not associated with either park use or frequency of exercise.	**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 Brownson, Housemann (2000) Missouri **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (access to community trails and paths, indoor facilities for physical activity, perceptions of safety on the trails) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (Risk factor survey)	**Not reported (for desired health outcomes)** **Positive Association for Trail Use in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Having fewer safety concerns on the trails leads to increased walking.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** TRAIL USE: 1. Concerns about safety did not appear to be a barrier to use, as 86.9% of trail users felt very safe when using trails.	**More Evidence Needed** Study design = Association Effect size = Not reported	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Sanderson, Foushee (2003) Alabama **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to safe, pleasant places to be active and/or walk, presence of sidewalks) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in Women (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals in neighborhoods with positive social dynamics and enablers for physical activity like safe and pleasant places to be active, and good quality sidewalks will have increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environmental 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. (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.)	**No Association for Physical Activity in Women** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in women	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High Education level from the evaluation sample was similar to the Alabama Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) demographic data for African-American women, however, income level was somewhat lower.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Molnar, Gortmaker (2004) Illinois **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (social disorder [fighting, drinking alcohol, peer groups with gang indicators, people selling drugs, prostitution] and physical disorder [graffiti, presence/ absence of cigarettes or cigars, abandoned cars, needles or syringes]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (interviews with youth and caregivers)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Physical and social environment disorder lead to perceptions of an unsafe neighborhood, which leads to decreased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In multilevel, multivariate analyses using hierarchical linear modeling, both neighborhood social disorder (coefficient= -0.40, $p<0.05$) and community members' assessment of the neighborhood as unsafe to play (coefficient= -1.44, $p<0.05$) were significantly and inversely associated with youth physical activity, controlling for both individual- and neighborhood-level SES, age, sex, race and BMI. 2. The association between neighborhood physical disorder and youth physical activity was in the expected direction but was not significant. 3. Using multilevel logistic regression, the odds of taking part in any recreational activity were 0.5 for each unit increase in the unsafe to play scale (95% CI: 0.3-0.8). The odds ratio for social disorder was 0.9 (95% CI: 0.8-1.1), and for physical disorder was 0.9 (95% CI: 0.7-1.1) (p-values not provided). 4. Increasing the safety of neighborhoods in which to play (from midpoint of bottom quartile to midpoint of top quartile) was associated with an increase of 49 minutes per week of physical activity ($p<0.05$). Decreasing social disorder (from midpoint of bottom quartile to midpoint of top quartile) was associated with an increase of 29 minutes per week ($p<0.05$).	**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 Burdette, Whitaker (2005) United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (observed frequency of adult loitering, gang activity, drunks or drug dealers, and disorderly or misbehaving groups of youths or adults in the neighborhood) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (parent survey), overweight/ obesity (height and weight [body mass index]), and sedentary behavior (parent survey)	**No Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Sedentary Behavior** **(Assumptions: Increased perceptions of neighborhood safety will lead to greater physical activity levels and lower body mass index [BMI]. Children in unsafe neighborhoods will have reduced time spent outside in physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Mean BMI z scores and obesity prevalence did not differ in children from the least safe to the safest tertile of neighborhood safety. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Children did not differ in weekend or weekday outdoor playtime across the neighborhood safety tertiles. SEDENTARY BEHAVIORS: 3. After adjusting for sociodemographic factors, children in the least safe neighborhoods watched more TV (201 ± 4 min vs. 182 ± 4 and 185 ±4 min in the medium and high safety tertiles, respectively, $p=0.001$) and were more likely to watch >2 hours of TV per day (66% vs. 60% and 62% in the medium and high tertiles, respectively, $p=0.02$). Children in the least safe tertile watched ~20 minutes more (~10% more) per day than children in the other 2 tertiles of neighborhood safety.	**No Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** **No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Sedentary Behavior** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for overweight/obesity or for physical activity in the study population, positive association for sedentary behavior in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Weir, Etelson (2006) New York **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (anxiety about gangs, crime, and aggression by other children) **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-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals living in an inner-city environment have increased problems with safety, which leads to decreased physical activity.)** **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.)	**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 Gordon-Larsen, McMurray (2000) United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (total reported incidents of serious crime in neighborhood) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and inactivity (7-day recall)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals that live in areas with high crime will be less likely to participate in physical activity than individuals living in safer neighborhoods.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Individuals residing in high crime levels were less likely to fall in the highest category of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (adjusted odds ratio [AOR]: 0.77, 95%CI: 0.66-0.91, p≤0.002). 2. Using a logistic regression revealed that females living in high crime areas were more likely to fall into the highest category of inactivity (AOR: 1.29, 95%CI: 1.03-1.62, p≤0.027).	**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** High The sample is a nationally representative sample of adolescents in the United States.
Author Lumeng, Appugliese (2006) AR, CA, MA, KS, NC, PA, VA, WA, WI **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (parental perception of safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (height and weight calculated body mass index [BMI])	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Positive parental perception of the neighborhood as less safe will lead to increased overweight/obesity in children.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Parents of children (n=79) who were overweight in first grade perceived their neighborhoods as significantly less safe than parents of children who were not overweight (7.08 vs. 7.75, respectively; p<0.001). 2. 17% of individuals in the first quartile (least perceived neighborhood safety) were overweight compared to 10% in the second quartile, 13% in the third quartile, and only 4% in the fourth quartile (highest perceived safety). 3. Children of parents who perceived the neighborhood as significantly less safe were more than four times more likely to be overweight (OR=4.43, 95% CI= 2.03-9.65, p<0.001). 4. None of the covariates altered the relationship between parental perception of neighborhood safety and overweight in first grade, and none of the interactions were statistically significant. 5. Parental perception of neighborhood safety independently increases the risk of being overweight in children 4.5 to 7 years [OR=9.44, 95% CI= 4.18-21.36, p≤0.001).	**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** Low The initial sample was representative of the demographics of the catchment areas from which the sample was recruited: 24% of the children were of an ethnic/racial minority, 10% of the mothers had less than a high school education, and 14% of the mothers were single at the time of the child's birth. The sample with complete data differed significantly in sex, racial composition, weight, and educational attainment from the sample without complete data (n=596).

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Kerr, Rosenberg (2006) Washington **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (parental perception of safety, neighborhood aesthetics, walking and bike facilities, street connectivity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Active commuting (survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased parental perceptions of neighborhood walkability will lead to more active commuting.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 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. 2. Parent concerns were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR= 5.2, 95%CI=2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 3. A parental concerns scale was most strongly associated with child active commuting (OR=5.2, 95% CI=2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 4. 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
Author Doyle, Kelly-Schwartz (2006) United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (community sprawl, crime rate, street connectivity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (weight and height [body mass index]) and walking behavior (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III, 1998-1994 [NHANES])	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased walkability, less sprawl, and increased safety lead to lower body mass index [BMI] and increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Individuals who live in counties that are more walkable and have lower crime rates tended to walk more and to have lower body mass indices (BMIs) than people in less walkable and more crime-prone areas, even after controlling for a variety of individual variables related to health (walkability; coefficient= -0.054, standard error=0.028, p<0.05, crime; coefficient= -2.00, standard error=4.20, not significant). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Individuals who live in counties that are more walkable and have lower crime rates tended to walk more than people in less walkable and more crime-prone areas (coefficient=0.053, standard error=0.020, p<0.01 for walkability, crime not significant). (Note: The walkability scale was measured using street connectivity, block size, and accessible routes.)	**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 physical activity and for overweight/obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported Respondents in the interview sample, but not the examination sample, tended to be somewhat older, less healthy, and more often non-Hispanic White. Because we included all of these variables as controls in our analysis, these differences should not affect our results.

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 walkabiltiy* [sidewalks, park/river, bus stop, shops, walking trails, connectivity], safety [ease of crossing streets, traffic, well lit sidewalk, walking map], convenience [sidewalks with few inclines, well maintained, wide], aesthetics (scenery, clean sidewalks, neighborhood conducive to walking, friendly neighbors], weather) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate and vigorous intensity physical activity and walking behavior (Community Health Activities Model Program for Seniors [CHAMPS] questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: The perception of a disorderly neighborhood environment will lead to decreased physical activity and increased overweight/obesity.)** **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). CHAMPS BASELINE AND INTERVENTION; 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 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. 4. 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). 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 Bennett, McNeill (2007) Massachusetts **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability/bikeability* (traffic safety, crime, aesthetics, land use mix, neighborhood design, perceived safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (Pedometer and Self-Efficacy and Exercise Habits Survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Men (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Women (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Positive perceptions of neighborhood safety leads to increased steps per day and physical activity self-efficacy.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For night-time reports of perceived neighborhood safety, the authors saw no association with steps per day among men (p=0.27). For women, however, feeling unsafe was significantly associated with steps per day in both age-adjusted bivariate and multivariable-adjusted models; women feeling unsafe at night had 1,107 fewer steps per day than those who identified their neighborhoods as safe in the multivariate model (p<0.01). 2. In multivariable-adjusted models, men reporting feeling a little unsafe at night were 51% less likely to have high physical activity self-efficacy than those who felt safe (OR=0.49, 95% CI=0.26-0.94). Men reporting feeling unsafe at night were 58% less likely to have high physical activity self-efficacy than those who felt safe (OR=0.42, 95%CI=0.16-1.10). For women, those feeling a little unsafe (OR=0.73, 95%CI=0.46-0.93) and unsafe (OR=0.74, 95%CI=0.46-0.92) at night were also less likely than those who felt safe to have high physical activity self-efficacy. 3. Using multivariable models revealed that there was a significant variation in physical activity self-efficacy for both men and women when looking at neighborhood security during the day. Men who felt a little unsafe or not at all safe were 51% less likely to have high physical activity self-efficacy, whereas women who felt similarly were 32% less likely.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Men** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Women** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population, men, and women	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author King, Castro (2000) United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (safety [traffic, crime, unattended dogs, streetlight quality, safety of recreational facilities], social support [perceived trust for neighbors]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (survey, the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS], and National Health Interview Survey items)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in African Americans (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with positive neighborhood perceptions of safety will be more likely to participate in physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Females reporting the presence of unattended dogs were more likely to be physically active (OR=1.20, 95% CI=1.01-1.42, p<0.05). 2. Through regression analyses three variables achieved statistical significance in African-Americans (n=646): frequently observing others exercising in one's neighborhood (OR=2.08, 95% CI=1.45-2.98, p<0.001) and the presence of unattended dogs in one's neighborhood (OR=1.51, 95% CI=1.06-2.15, p<0.05) were positively associated with physical activity while care-giving (OR=0.84, 95% CI=0.74-0.96, p<0.05) was negatively associated with physical activity. (Overall Model, X^2 (28, N = 646) = 70.2, p< 0.0001.)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in African Americans** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for physical activity in the study population and positive association for physical activity in African Americans	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High This study was able to obtain a representative distribution of minority and low-income women. The study was unable to obtain sufficient numbers of Asian-Pacific Island women to be in the sample because of language difficulties and cultural barriers.
Author Hooker, Wilson (2005) South Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (access to facilities, safety [traffic, unattended dogs, crime, lack of sidewalks]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior and meeting physical activity recommendations (survey and the 2001 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System [BRFSS])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Caucasians (Safety-Interpersonal)** **No Association for Physical Activity in African Americans (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with positive perceptions of neighborhood safety are more likely to walk and meet recommended levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 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. 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.	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Caucasians** **No Association for Physical Activity in African Americans** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive Association for Physical Activity in Caucasians and no association for physical activity in African Americans	**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 Voorhees, Young (2003) Virginia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (lighting, traffic, dogs, crime, sidewalks, places within walking distance, 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])	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumptions: Individuals with increased 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-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). (Note: No p-values reported.)	**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 McDonald (2008) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (crime data [arson, burglary, murder, robbery, weapons offenses, prostitution]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (2000 Bay Area Travel Survey [BATS] and the Activity Diary)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals living in neighborhoods with decreased safety will participate in less physical activity than their counterparts.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The model showed a significant negative association between violent crime and minutes walked per day (β=-0.07; p=0.016). 2. Neither property nor quality of life crimes were correlated with amount of walking. 3. The model results showed that a SD increase in violent crime (16.3 crimes per 1000 block group residents) is associated with a decrease in walking rates by a factor of 0.32 (CI=0.13, 0.81) (no p-value given). 4. The reference person with no vehicle access walked 14.1 minutes more per day living in a very low crime neighborhood (5th percentile) compared with a very high crime neighborhood (95th percentile). 5. The model predicts a difference of 4.4 minutes of walking per day for individuals with access to a vehicle depending on whether they live in a high-or low-crime area.	**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 Forsyth, Hearst (2008), Forsyth, Oakes (2007), Oakes, Forsyth (2007) Minnesota **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (street pattern and connectivity, residential density, distance to work and nearby stores, neighborhood aesthetics, street lights, sidewalks, street buffers) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior and total physical activity (International Physical Activity Questionnaire and 7-day travel and walking diary)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Improved street design and access to destinations will increase physical activity)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Using Spearman's correlations there was significant positive association with accelerometry physical activity and perceptions of crime (although significant r values were low, results not shown). 2. (N=511 IPAQ; N=709 Diary) Travel walking measured both by survey and diary was positively correlated with litter/graffiti (IPAQ; CE; 0.3325; Diary; CE; 0.5238) (p<0.05).	**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 Catlin, Simoes (2003) Missouri **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (perceived criminal safety, traffic safety, pleasantness of neighborhood) (walking/biking trails, parks, public outdoor exercise facilities) **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-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Community and worksite infrastructure that promotes physical activity and the perception that the community is safe and pleasing are associated with increased levels of physical activity, which leads to decreased levels of overweight/obesity.)** **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: 1.06-2.28) 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.
Author Jago, Baranowski (2006); Jago, Baranowski (2005) Texas **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (walking and cycling ease, sidewalk characteristics, street access and condition, intersection density, perceived safety, crime, absence of sidewalks, presence of dogs) **Outcome(s) Affected** Light intensity physical activity, sedentary behavior, and walking/cycling behavior(accelerometer and Systematic Pedestrian and Cycling Environmental Scan) and overweight/obesity	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Aesthetically pleasing environments with accessible places for physical activity lead to increased walking and cycling levels.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Walking and cycling ease was positively associated with crime (r= -0.325, p<0.001).	**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 Wen, Kandula (2007) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (afraid to go out at night, parks safe during the day, parks safe during the night, neighborly trust and helpfulness, access to park/playground/open space) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (the 2003 California Health Interview Survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased perceptions of neighborhood safety and social cohesion, as well as access to places to be physically active lead to increased total walking.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood factors (i.e., social cohesion, availability of parks/playgrounds, safety) did not seem to mediate racial/ethnic differences in walking at recommended levels. 2. Neighborhood safety was not significantly associated with walking at recommended levels in any subgroup analysis.	**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 Burdette, Whitaker (2004) Ohio **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (number of serious crimes [murder, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, larceny, and auto theft] number of 911 calls, proximity to nearest playground, distance to fast food restaurants) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (WIC program database [body mass index - BMI])	**No Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Residential proximity to places for physical activity will lead to increased physical activity, which will lead to decreased overweight/obesity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. The prevalence of children with BMI ≥ 95th percentile and BMI ≥ 85th percentile did not differ statistically across the quintiles of neighborhood crime rate, but did differ significantly for 911 call rate. % BMI ≥95th percentile ranged from 10.7% in the lowest quintile to 9.4% in the highest quintile (p=0.04). BMI ≥85th percentile ranged from 22.7% in the lowest quintile of call rate to 22.1% in the highest quintile (p=0.02). There was no clear trend suggesting that lower levels of neighborhood safety were associated with a higher prevalence of overweight. 2. After controlling for poverty ratio (as a measure of SES), child race, and child sex, the 3 environmental predictor variables (playground proximity, fast food restaurant proximity and neighborhood safety) were still not significantly associated with childhood overweight.	**No Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for overweight/obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Babey, Hastert (2008) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (perceived safety, housing type, urbanicity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (self-reported survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Access to parks and increased safety within the neighborhood lead to higher levels of activity in children.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Stratified analyses revealed that access to a safe park was positively associated with regular activity (relative risk [RR]= 1.10, 95% CI= 1.01-1.17, p<0.05) and negatively associated with inactivity (RR=0.58, 95% CI= 0.39-0.86, p<0.01) for adolescents in urban areas, but not rural areas. 2. In stratified analyses, adolescents with access to a safe park were less likely to be inactive than those without access, among those living in (1) apartments (RR= 0.52, 95% CI= 0.28-0.96, p<0.05) but not houses, (2) neighborhoods perceived as unsafe (RR= 0.47, 95% CI= 0.23-0.93, p<0.05) but not in safe neighborhoods, and (3) lower-income (RR= 0.62, 95% CI=0.39-0.97, p<0.05) but not higher income families. However, access to a safe park was not significantly associated with regular activity for these groups. (Note: Access to a park and access to a safe park overlapped placing these results in both Safety Interpersonal and Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers.)	**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 Gomez, Johnson (2004) Texas **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (crime density, perceived neighborhood safety [unsafe to play], distance to nearest open play area) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (recall questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Decreased neighborhood safety [increased violence] leads to lower levels of outdoor physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For girls, as violent crime within 1/2 mile of home increased, outdoor physical activity (OPA) significantly decreased (β= -0.34,T= -0.3.568, p<0.001) (accounted for 9.4% of variances in girls' OPA). While the perception of feeling safe in the neighborhood increased, OPA also increased significantly (β=0.223, T=2.343, p=0.021).	**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** High The barrio is inhabited primarily by Mexican-Americans and is characterized by low-income household and high crime rates. The racial/ethnic composition of the study sample closely matched that of the school district to which the study schools, except the private school, belong, with 91% of the students in the district being Mexican-American.
Author Romero, Robinson (2001) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (neighborhood hazards [perceptions of traffic, trash, crime, drugs and gangs, noise, prejudice], access to parks) **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-Interpersonal)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with fewer neighborhood hazards will participate in more physical activity, which will lead to lower body mass index [BMI].)** **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). (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 physical activity and overweight/ obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Suminski, Poston (2005) Midwestern United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (integrity of sidewalks and streets, traffic volume and speed, lighting, crime, aesthetics, availability of shops, parks, work and schools) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking for exercise and walking for transportation (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Having a safe neighborhood with destinations within walking distance leads to increased physical activity and active transportation.)** **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). (Note: Neighborhood "safety" was a composite score using traffic volume and speed, lighting, and crime.)	**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 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-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Equipment accessibility and increased neighborhood safety lead to increased levels of physical activity.)** **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 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
Author Adkins, Sherwood (2004) Minnesota **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (parent and child perceptions of safety [safe to play outside], parks and playgrounds nearby) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (accelerometers and psychosocial survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased perceived neighborhood safety and access to facilities will increase physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Perceived neighborhood safety and access to facilities for physical activity, as reported by the parent and daughter and the family environment reported by the parent, were not related to girl's activity level.	**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 Handy, Cao (2008); Handy, Cao (2006) California **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (aesthetics, presence of outdoor spaces, safety [crime, lighting], distance from residence to destinations) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking and biking behavior (survey measured frequency of transport and leisure walking and walking to specific destinations in the past 30 days, change in walking and biking before the move [for movers] or from one year ago [for non-movers] and frequency/intensity of activity in the previous week)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Access to certain environmental characteristics is associated with increased levels of physical activity)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Perceived safety (coefficient =-0.071, p=0.029) remained negatively associated with walking and attractiveness (coefficient=0.078, p=0.038) remained positively associated. 2. Current safety (NPA coefficient=0.0672, p=0.025; walking coefficient=0.15, p<0.001) were associated with increased neighborhood physical activity and 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** Low According to the 2000 US Census the evaluation sample tended to be older on average than neighborhood residents and the percent of households with children is lower among the evaluation sample for most neighborhoods. Median household income for the evaluation sample was higher than the census median for all but one neighborhood.

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-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Access to facilities and positive perceptions of neighborhood safety [crime and traffic] and pleasantness will lead to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=1.53, 95% CI= 1.1-2.11) and feeling unsafe from crime (OR=1.71, 95% CI= 1.19-2.46) were neighborhood environmental perceptions associated with being obese. 2. Furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=2.74, 95% CI= 1.68-4.48), having 3-6 destination types near home (OR=1.76, 95%CI= 1.09-2.84), and feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.59, 95% CI= 1.56-4.28) were neighborhood environmental perceptions associated with being obese. 3. Neighborhood perceptions of a lack of places to be physically active (OR=1.46, 95%CI= 1.1-1.94), no available equipment (OR=1.55, 95%CI=1.19-2.02), 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), feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.09, 95%CI= 1.5-2.92, p<0.05), feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=1.65, 95%CI=1.2-2.27, p<0.05), 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), and having an unmaintained community (OR=1.48, 95%CI=1.09-1.99) were all associated with being obese. 4. 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), feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.91, 95%CI= 1.86-4.55, p<0.05), feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=2.46, 95%CI= 1.63-3.71, p<0.05), and 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) were all associated with being obese/inactive. 5. Women had stronger associations between obesity and feeling slightly/not at all safe from crime (OR= 2.4; 95% CI= 1.6-3.5).	**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 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 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) and overweight/obesity (height and weight (body mass index])	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Perceptions of unsafe traffic and disorder lead to decreased physical activity in children.)** **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.)	**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 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 (assessed with a survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with 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 will increase their levels of physical activity.)** **Safety Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Adolescent and parent report multivariate regression models revealed a negative estimate was found for crime threat in relation to the number of sites to which adolescents walked/biked. (no statistics reported)	**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 Zenk, Wilbur (2009) Illinois **Design** Association Non-randomized trial (environmental measures cross-sectional) **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (street connectivity, land-use mix, residential and public transit stop density, perceptions of crime, crime reports) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (walking log books and heart rate monitors)	**No Association for Physical Activity in Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Neighborhood walkability and availability of walking facilities/spaces were hypothesized to positively influence adherence to a home-based walking intervention, whereas lower neighborhood safety and unpleasant neighborhood aesthetics were hypothesized to negatively affect adherence.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood safety was not statistically significantly associated with adherence to walking prescriptions. There was no evidence that the environment moderated the effect of intervention group on adherence (results not shown).	**No Association for Physical Activity in Study Population** Design = Intervention evaluation Duration = High Effective size = No association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Reported **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Sharpe, Granner (2004) South Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to safe, pleasant places to be active and/or walk) **Outcome(s) Affected** Meeting physical activity recommendations, physical activity (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Access to safe and pleasant places for physical activity leads to increased levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Prior to adjustment, significant associations with physical activity included perceived safety of areas in the county to walk, job, ride a bike, or do other physical activities (data not shown).	**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 Hoehner, Brennan (2005) Missouri and Georgia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to safe places to be active, land-use mix, street segments, sidewalks) **Outcome(s) Affected** Transportation activity, meeting physical activity recommendations (telephone survey)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with greater access to safe places to be physically active will participate in increased transportation and/or recreational physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Those in the highest quartile for segments with minimal garbage, litter, or broken glass were 0.4 times less likely (95%CI: 0.3-0.7) to engage in transportation activity and 0.4 times less likely (95%CI: 0.2-0.7) to meet recommendations through transportation activity than those in the lowest quartile ($p<0.05$ for trend). 2. Those in the highest quartile of physical disorder were 0.5 (95%CI: 0.3-0.8) and 0.4 (95%CI: 0.2-0.7) times less likely to engage in transportation activity or meet recommendations through transportation activity, respectively ($p<0.05$ for trend).	**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 The sample was diverse with respect to age, ethnicity, and educational attainment, and slightly under-represented men.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Heinrich, Lee (2008); Heinrich, Lee (2007) Midwest United States **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (street connectivity and accessibility of safe and inviting places to be active) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (height and weight determined body mass index) and moderate and vigorous physical activity and walking (Pathways to Health study data [National Health Interview Survey and interviews])	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumptions: Greater accessibility to physical activity resources, the presence of amenities, better street design, and greater safety lead to decreased overweight/obesity and increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. At the aggregated neighborhood level (n=12), 71% of the variance in obesity prevalence was accounted for by accessibility (β=-1.02, p=0.05), average feature quality (β=1.05, p=0.09), average number of amenities per resource (β=-1.19, p=0.03), and average incivilities per resource (β=0.70, p=0.04), (F(4,11) 4.32, p<0.05). 2. Male gender and increased quality of features (F(11,407)37.19 and 12.66, p<0.001) predicted lower BMI among residents. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 3. Greater neighborhood street connectivity (β=0.672, p=0.001) and fewer average incivilities per neighborhood (β=-0.54, p=0.005) were associated with more days walked per week [F=21.8 (2,11); p<0.001; R^2=0.83].	**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
Author Cohen, Ashwood (2006) Washington D.C., Maryland, South Carolina **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Active neighborhoods* (access to parks, presence of lighting, restroom, shaded areas, fountains, fencing, open spaces, playing fields, courts within the parks, and street connectivity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate to vigorous physical activity (accelerometers)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Park proximity, park type, and park features leads to increased physical activity in adolescent girls.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Streetlights (28 min for 3.0 MET; 18 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.05 for both) were associated with increased MVPA. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	**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 20% Black and 6% Hispanic, and 10% of households were below poverty level (neighborhood average; ½ mile radius)

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
International				
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]) and walking for recreation and transport, and meeting recommendations for vigorous-intensity activity, and physical activity (survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: 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.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The likelihood of walking for recreation was higher in residents for those who perceived their neighborhood as being attractive, safe, and interesting (OR=1.49, 95%CI: 1.14-1.95, p=0.003) than those who did not have those perceptions. 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) than those who did not have those perceptions. 3. 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) than those who did not have those perceptions.	**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 Carver, Timperio (2008) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood safety* (parent and child perceptions of traffic, road safety, crosswalks, traffic calming devices, trash, graffiti, crime rate, strangers, safety at night) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) (accelerometers)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity for Boys in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Positive perceptions of neighborhood safety leads to increased physical activity.)** **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).	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity for Boys in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity for boys in the study population and no association for physical activity in the overall study population	**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.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Kirby, Levesque (2007) Canada (Moose Factory Island) **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (convenience of shops, stores and other nearby places, safety of the community for walking, aesthetics of the community) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity and walking behavior (Godin Leisure-Time Questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Native Americans (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Positive perceptions of convenience, safety, aesthetics, and the presence of features for physical activity lead to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The square root of safety was significantly related to total weekly walking ($p<0.05$; $\beta=0.130$).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in Native Americans** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in Native Americans	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported Statistics Canada did not completely enumerate Moose Factory during the 1996 and 2001 Censuses, it is not possible to confirm the representativeness of the sample.
Author Harrison, Gemmell (2007) United Kingdoma **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (feeling of safety during the day and night, perceived frequency of vandalism, assaults, muggings, speeding traffic, placement of leisure facilities, sense of belonging to the area, placement of transport, placement of shopping) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity and meeting physical activity recommendations (Godin and Shephard instrument)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Having access to places to safely walk leads to greater levels of physical activity.)** **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.	**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 De Bourdeaudhuij, Sallis (2003) Belgium **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, land-use mix, accessibility [access to shopping, access to public transportation], sidewalks, bike lanes, aesthetics, safety [perceptions of crime and traffic], street connectivity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (height and weight [body mass index]) and walking behavior, sedentary behavior, moderate intensity activity, and vigorous intensity activity (International Physical Activity Questionnaire-short form [IPAQ] and seven-page questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Sedentary Behavior for Males in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumptions: Increased perceptions of neighborhood safety and access to places to be physically active will lead to increased physical activity and decreased body mass index [BMI].)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Participants with a higher BMI reported less safety from crime (Pearson r= -0.11, $p<0.05$), less physical activity equipment in the home (Pearson r= -0.15, $p<0.001$), and fewer convenient physical activity facilities (Pearson r=-0.11, $p<0.05$). SEDENTARY BEHAVIOR 2. In males, the amount of sitting was related to higher perceived criminality in the neighborhood (semi-partial correlate; -0.22, $p\leq0.01$).	**Positive Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Sedentary Behavior in Males in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/ obesity in the study population and positive association for sedentary behavior in males in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Low Respondents appear to have better jobs, have a higher education, are more often employed, and underrepresent the number of individuals living alone compared with the Flemish reference population.
Author Kondo, Lee (2009) Japan **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, land-use mix [diversity and access], street connectivity, aesthetics, safety [perceptions of crime and traffic]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Leisure and transport walking (Accelerometers and the International Physical Activity Questionnaire [IPAQ])	**No Association for Physical Activity for Males in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Improved neighborhood walkability and perceived safety will increase physical activity)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For males, there were no differences in walking steps between the high scoring group and the low scoring group for safety. (Note: Multiple GIS and perception measures were used to determine respondent's walkability score.)	**No Association for Physical Activity for Males in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity for males in the study population	**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 Miles (2008) Europe **Design** Association Cross-sectional **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (housing conditions, type of housing area [e.g. multi-family], traffic volume, physical disorder [presence or absence of litter], graffiti or greenery, perceived safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity and use of resources (Large Analysis and Review of European housing and health status survey [LARES])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **No Association for Physical Activity in Men (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Women (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Facility Use in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased neighborhood physical disorder will lead to decreased perceptions of safety, which will lead to decreased levels of physical activity and use of local playgrounds.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For men, neither neighborhood disorder nor perceived safety showed significant associations with the respondent's current involvement in sports or exercise. For women, living in a neighborhood with signs of low compared to high physical disorder was associated with a significant increase in the risk of occasional versus no sports or exercise (Relative Risk Ratio= 1.28, 95% CI=1.03-1.60, p<0.05). 2. Neighborhood physical disorder was associated only with adult respondents' occasional involvement in sports or exercise and only among women (p<0.05), perceived safety was not significantly associated with physical activity for either men or women. FACILITY USE: 3. Respondents in neighborhoods with signs of low or moderate physical disorder compared to high physical disorder had slightly more than twice the odds of encouraging use of local playgrounds (OR=2.14, 95% CI=1.54-2.97, p<0.01 and OR=2.09, 95% CI=0.65-2.64, p<0.01, respectively). 4. Respondents reporting that they felt safe in their neighborhood had more than twice the odds of encouraging the use of playgrounds compared to those who indicated they did not feel safe (OR=2.83, 95% CI=2.29-3.49, p<0.01); those reporting that they had feelings the neighborhood was somewhat safe had 60% greater odds of encouraging playground use than those who reported feeling unsafe (OR=1.60, 95% CI= 1.27-2.01, p<0.01).	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **No Association for Physical Activity in Men** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Women** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for physical activity in men and positive assocaition for physical activity in women and the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Carnegie, Bauman (2002) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (perceived safety; friendliness of area; aesthetics; access to shops, rest areas and parks; barking dogs) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (1996 Physical Activity Survey for the State of New South Wales [NSW])	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(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-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. The "dogs barking" variable showed no relationship with walking activity nor did the "safety at night" question.	**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 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 Li, Dibley (2006) China **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (access to recreational facilities [playgrounds, gyms, sports equipment, public open spaces], access to sidewalks, level of residence, safety concerns, parents allowing children to play without supervision) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (adolescent physical activity recall questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Lack of opportunities for physical activity and unsafe neighborhood environments will lead to increased levels of inactivity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Concerns about neighborhood safety (OR= 2.1, 95% CI=1.1-4.1, p=0.03) was positively associated with inactivity. 2. Perceived unsafe neighborhoods were associated with a higher percentage of inactive adolescents, but the difference was not statistically significant (p=0.08).	**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 Utter, Denny (2006) New Zealand **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (park, youth center, skateboard ramp, sports field, swimming pool, gym, bike track, perception of neighborhood safety) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity (survey)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased perceived physical activity facilities and social motivation leads to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood safety was positively associated with participation in regular physical activity (OR=1.46, 95% CI: 1.3-1.6, no p-value given).	**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** High Participating students were demographically similar to the general New Zealand population of young people aged 13 to 17 years.

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)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in Girls in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in Boys in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(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-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Among boys, perceiving that it was a safe neighborhood to walk/cycle to school (B=-1.92, p=0.07) was positively associated with weekly walking frequency. Although, only total number of accessible destinations score remained significantly positively associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (p<0.05). 2. Among girls, the perceptions of nice houses in the neighborhood (B=2.98, p=0.003); lots of neighborhood graffiti (B=2.59, p=0.04); nice neighborhood house gardens (B=1.91, p=0.03); safety in the neighborhood for walking/cycling to school (B=2.78, p=0.03); and having an easily walkable/cyclable neighborhood (B=2,75, p=0.0001); were significantly positively associated with walking frequency. Easy to walk/cycle and lots of grafitti 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 (B=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.	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in Girls in the Study Population** **Negative Association for Physical Activity in Boys in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for physical activity in girls and boys in the study population.	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Carver, Salmon (2005) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkabilty* (parent and child perceptions of accessibility [sports facilities, public open spaces], safe places to walk and ride bikes, traffic, bullies, strangers, unattended dogs) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking and cycling behaviors (Questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Positive adolescent and parent perceptions of their neighborhood leads to increased physical activity in adolescents.)** **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).	**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 Kamphuis, Van Lenthe (2008) The Netherlands **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (social cohesion/trust, social disorganization [litter, graffiti, vandalism, crime, public intoxication], places for physical activity) **Outcome(s) Affected** Participation in sports (Short Questionnaire to Assess Health-enhancing Physical Activity [SQUASH])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased safety and having access to places for physical activity lead to an increase in sports participation.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Unsafe neighborhood (OR=1.77, 95%CI: 1.18-2.65, p=0.005) increased the likelihood of not participating in sports.	**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 Duncan, Mummery (2005) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (safe to walk, presence of dogs, friendliness of neighbors, traffic, crosswalks, street lights, sidewalks in good condition, open spaces, shops, services) **Outcome(s) Affected** Physical activity, recreational walking, and general walking (Active Australia Physical Activity Questionnaire)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumptions: 1) Greater access to parks and paths leads to increased levels of physical activity. 2) Individuals with access to cleaner, safer, and more aesthetically pleasing environments participate in higher levels of physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. People not agreeing that their neighborhood was clean and tidy were 2.67 times more likely to attain sufficient levels of activity than those people who agreed with the statement (OR=2.67, CI=1.28-5.55). 2. People whose home was classed as being in the middle tertile of registered dog numbers within 0.8 kilometers were 66% more likely to have reported some recreational walking than those people living in a residence with the lowest tertile of registered dog numbers (OR=1.66, CI=1.13-2.43). (Note: Registered dog owners examined as a proxy for unattended dogs.)	**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 Mota, Gomes (2007) Portugal **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to destinations, street connectivity, neighborhood safety, social environment, aesthetics, recreation facilities) **Outcome(s) Affected** Leisure time physical activity (Leisure Time Physical Activity [LTPA] Questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased neighborhood walkability and a safe environment will lead to increased physical activity)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. In girls, personal safety (crime rate) was significantly and negatively (Rho = -0.10, p≤0.02) associated with LTPA. 2. Logistic regression analysis (data not shown) showed that girls who agreed that "the crime rate in my neighborhood makes it unsafe or unpleasant to walk in my neighborhood" were more likely to be non-LTPA (OR = 0.60, 95% CI = 0.39–0.91, p = .02).	**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 Mota, Gomes (2007) Portugal **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (access to destination, street connectivity, infrastructure for walking and cycling, neighborhood safety, social environment, aesthetics, and recreation facilities) **Outcome(s) Affected** Active transportation (student questionnaire)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased neighborhood street connectivity will lead to increased active transportation.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood safety was of borderline statistical significance (p=0.07). 21.8% of active vs. 28.8% of passive travelers agreed that neighborhood crime made it unsafe or unpleasant to walk.	**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 Santana, Santos (2008) Portugal **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (residential density, mixed-land use, street connectivity, aesthetics, crime and accident rates) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity, physical activity and fruit and vegetable intake (National Health Survey (NHS) 1998-1999 (height and weight [body mass index], leisure activities, fruit and vegetable intakes, vigorous and moderate intensity activity)	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Nutrition in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumptions: 1) Increased neighborhood safety (traffic and interpersonal) and social support lead to increased physical activity and decreased overweight/obesity. 2) Increased neighborhood safety and social support leads to increased nutrition and decreased overweight/obesity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. BMI increased in association with crimes against property (OR=1.02, 95% CI= 1.01-1.03, p<0.05). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. There was a negative association between moderate physical activity and crimes against property (OR=0.98, 95% CI= 0.97-0.99, p<0.05). NUTRITION: 3. Fruit and vegetable intake was negatively associated with the number of crimes against property (OR= 0.98, 95% CI=0.98-0.99), p<0.05).	**Positive Association for Overweight/obesity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Nutrition in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for overweight/obesity, physical activity and nutrition in the study population in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Humpel, Owen (2004) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (accessibility [park, path or cycleway, lake or beach, shops], aesthetics, safety [friendliness of neighbors, unattended dogs, traffic, damaged sidewalks]) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (self-reported survey)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Positive environmental perceptions, closer residence to a coastal area, and accessibility of facilities lead to increased walking.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. No evidence of a relationship between safety and neighborhood walking was found for men or women. 2. Men who perceived their environment as highly safe for walking were less likely to walk for pleasure (OR=0.22; 95% CI 0.06-0.78; p<0.05).	**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 Burton, Turrell (2005) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Active neighborhoods* (access to places to be active, safety, aesthetic quality, traffic, street lights, transit) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate and vigorous intensity physical activity and walking (questionnaire)	**More Evidence Needed-Data Not Reported (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with greater access to places for physical activity and active transportation will be more likely to participate in greater amounts of physical activity.)** **Safety Interpersonal** 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 in 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
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 (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(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-Interpersonal** 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 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, 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.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Prezza, Pilloni (2001) Italy **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (perceptions of traffic and safety, fear of crime, neighborhood relations, sense of community) **Outcome(s) Affected** Use of neighborhood space and child's play (interviews)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Increased parental perceptions of safety in the community will lead to increased independent play, which will lead to increased physical activity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY [CHILD'S PLAY]: 1. After adding mothers psycho-social variables to the multiple regression analysis child's independent mobility was found to be associated with traffic perception (β=0.129, p<0.05) and neighborhood relations (β=0.196, p<0.001); child's autonomy in home-school route and in errands was associated with neighborhood relations (β=0.12, p<0.05); and child's play with peers was associated with safety perception (β=-0.14, p<0.05) and neighborhood relations (β=0.229).	**More Evidence Needed** Study design = Association Effect size = Not reported	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported No significant differences were found regarding children's demographic characteristics either when they were sub-divided according to type of neighborhood or to type of space utilizable near home (all children in sample).
Author Lee, Kawakubo (2006) Japan **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (crime, traffic, green space) **Outcome(s) Affected** Walking behavior (questionnaire)	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: The perception of a disorderly neighborhood environment will lead to decreased physical activity and increased overweight/obesity.)** **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). CHAMPS BASELINE AND INTERVENTION: 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 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. 4. 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). 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

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Veugelers, Sithole (2008) Nova Scotia, Canada **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (opportunities for recreation, access to neighborhood shops) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (height and weight [body mass index]), sports engagement (parent survey), eating behavior (the Harvard Food Frequency Questionnaire), and physical activity (screen time, parent survey)	**No Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Access to places for physical activity and greater land-use mix are related to children's diet, weight, and participation in physical and sedentary activities. Greater access leads to better behavioral and health outcomes.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. There was no association between neighborhood safety and overweight and obesity.	**No Association for Overweight/ obesity in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = No association for overweight/ obesity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported
Author Stafford, Cummins (2007) England and Scorland **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood walkability* (land-use density, urban sprawl, and population density) **Outcome(s) Affected** Overweight/obesity (combined data; Health Survey for England [HSE] and Scottish Health Survey [SHS])	**Positive Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Individuals with greater access to safe neighborhoods and increased opportunities for physical activity will participate in greater amounts of physical activity, which will lead to decreased overweight/obesity.)** **Safety-Interpersonal** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. BMI was indirectly linked to neighborhood disorder through average sports participation rate (indirect path coefficient=0.013, $p<0.05$). 2. Greater neighborhood disorder was associated with a higher waist-to-hip ratio (coefficient=0.053, $p<0.05$).	**Positive Association for in the Study Population** Study design = Association Effect size = Positive association for physical activity in the study population	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** High The data was representative of the general population of England and Scotland. The sample of postcode sectors slightly over-represented deprived and urban post-code sectors in England and under-represented deprived postcode sectors in Scotland.

Study Description	Measures & Outcomes	Effect Size or % Change	Effectiveness	Maintenance & Representativeness
Author Timperio, Giles-Corti (2008) Australia **Design** Association Cross-sectional study **Duration** Not Applicable	**Measures** *Neighborhood accessibility* (access to free public open spaces and recreational facilities) **Outcome(s) Affected** Moderate to vigorous physical activity (accelerometers)	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population (Safety-Interpersonal)** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls (Safety-Interpersonal)** **(Assumption: Access to and increased number of parks and open spaces leads to increased physical activity in youth.)** **Safety Interpersonal** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Adolescent girls had more moderate-to-vigorous physical activity after school if their closest public open space had signage regarding dogs (β=6.8 min/day, p<0.05) compared with other girls. 2. Lighting along paths was inversely associated with weekend moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (β= -54.9 min/day, p<0.05).	**Negative Association for Physical Activity in the Study Population** **Positive Association for Physical Activity in Girls** Study design = Association Effect size = Negative association for physical activity in the study population and a positive association for physical activity for girls	**Maintenance** Not Applicable **Sampling / Representativeness** Not Reported

IMPACT TABLES

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
United States						
Author Cohen, McKenzie (2007) California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults (targeted sample) On average, the neighborhoods surrounding the parks were 63.5% Latino, 31.0% African American. 1.8% White and 30.4% lower income	**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 park safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to public parks and park characteristics 2. Availability of public parks **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. Younger age, being male, and living within 1 mile of a park were positively associated with the frequency of leisure exercise (incident rate ratio= 1.38, 95%CI=1.04-1.84, p<0.001) 2. More residents living within 0.5 miles of the park reported leisurely exercising 5 or more times per week more often than those living more than 1 mile away (49% vs. 35%, p<0.01). 3. People who lived within 1 mile of the park had an average of 38% more exercise sessions per week than those living further away. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Younger age, being male, and living within 1 mile of a park were positively associated with the frequency of leisure exercise (incident rate ratio= 1.38, 95%CI=1.04-1.84, p<0.001) and park use (incident rate ratio=4.21, 95%CI=2.54-7.00, p<0.001). 2. More residents living within 0.5 miles of the park reported leisurely exercising 5 or more times per week more often than those living more than 1 mile away (49% vs. 35%, p<0.01). 3. People who lived within 1 mile of the park were 4 times as likely to visit the park once a week or more and had an average of 38% more exercise sessions per week than those living further away. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. Among observed park users, 43% lived within 0.25 mile, and another 21% lived between 0.25 and 0.5 mile of the park (p<0.001). Only 13% of park users lived more than 1 mile from the park. 2. Of local residents, 38% living more than 1 mile away were infrequent park visitors, compared with 19% of those living less than 0.5 mile away (p<0.001). 3. Younger age, being male, and living within 1 mile of a park were positively associated with park use (incident rate ratio=4.21, 95%CI=2.54-7.00, p<0.001). 4. People who lived within 1 mile of the park were 4 times as likely to visit the park once a week or more than those living further away. 5. Nearly all respondents (98%) living near the 2 parks with the lowest percentage of households in poverty indicated that they felt the parks were safe, compared with between 50% and 74% for parks in neighborhoods with over 40% of households in poverty (no p-values given).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Brownson, Housemann (2000) Missouri	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was 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 was provided. Perceptions of safety while using trails MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Availability of places to walk and be physically active and barriers and enablers for trails and use of trails 2. Access to walking trails **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. Travel distance to walking trails appeared to have a slight perceived effect on walking. Compares to those traveling 1-4 miles, those travelling 5-10 miles (prevalence odds ratio= 0.8, 95%CI= 0.4-1.9), 11-29 miles (prevalence odds ratio=0.8, 95%CI=0.3-2.1), or >30 miles to a trail (prevalence odds ratio=0.7, 95%CI=0.3-1.8) had a reduced likelihood of increasing their walking. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Persons who were regular walkers were more likely to have access to indoor exercise facilities (prevalence odds ratio=1.3, 95%CI=1.0-1.7). 2. Travel distance to walking trails appeared to have a slight perceived effect on walking. Compared to those traveling 1-4 miles, those travelling 5-10 miles (prevalence odds ratio= 0.8, 95%CI= 0.4-1.9), 11-29 miles (prevalence odds ratio=0.8, 95%CI=0.3-2.1), or >30 miles to a trail (prevalence odds ratio=0.7, 95%CI=0.3-1.8) had a reduced likelihood of increasing their walking. TRAIL USE: 3. Among persons with access to walking trails, 38.8% had used the trails. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. Persons using longer trails (>0.25 miles) were more likely to report an increase in physical activity (0.25 to 0.50 miles in length: prevalence odds ratio= 2.8, 95%CI=1.1-7.2; >0.50 miles in length: prevalence odds ratio= 13.2, 95%CI= 1.4-124.6). 2. Among persons who had used the trails, 55.2% reported that they had increased their amount of walking since they began using the trail. 3. Women were more than twice as likely (prevalence odds ratio= 2.1, 95%CI=1-4.4) as men to report that they had increased the amount of walking since they began using the trails. 4. Lower-income groups were more likely to have increased walking due to trail use than were higher income persons ($15-35K: prevalence odds ratio= 0.9, 95%CI=0.4-2; ≥ $35K: prevalence odds ratio= 0.4, 95%CI= 0.2-1) 5. African Americans were more likely to have increased walking due to trail use (prevalence odds ratio= 1.9, 95%CI= 0.5-7.7) than were Caucasians.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Sanderson, Foushee (2003) Alabama	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. 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 was provided. Perceptions of safety from crime and presence of street lights MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Presence or absence of sidewalks 2. Access to places for physical activity and access to places within walking distance 3. Perceptions of traffic safety 4. Availability of places to walk 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	**Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environmental variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environmental variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environmental variables that were significantly associated with comparison of either activity-level group. **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Researchers found no physical environmental 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 resources and access to 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 (OR=1.82, 95% CI=1.06-3.15), 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=3.82, 95% CI=2.16-6.75).
Author Molnar, Gortmaker (2004) Illinois	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Urban, 11-16 year olds and their caregivers, 35.1% African-American, 47.1% Hispanic, 3.4% Other, 14.3% Caucasian (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 interpersonal safety (fighting, gang, drugs) in the neighborhood **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Burdette, Whitaker (2005) United States	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 3-4 year olds, 35% Lower-income, 48% Black non-Hispanic, 26% Hispanic (any race), 22% White non-Hispanic, 4% other race, non-Hispanic (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 interpersonal safety **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	Not Reported
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 safety (crime) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood safety (traffic) **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. 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). 2. 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.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Gordon-Larsen, McMurray (2000) United States	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 11-21 year olds, 50.8% male, 49.2% female, 66.7% non-Hispanic White, 16.7% non-Hispanic Black, 12.7% Hispanic, 4% Asian, 32.3% low family income (>$26,200), 37% middle family income ($26,200-50,000), 30.6% high family income (+$50,000) [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 safety related to serious neighborhood crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Use of community recreation centers 2. Physical education classes **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**School Physical Activity and Environment Policies** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Having physical education 1 to 4 times per week and 5 times per week were associated with a substantial increase in likelihood of falling in the highest category of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (AOR: 1.44, 95% CI: 1.09-1.92; p≤0.01 and AOR: 2.21; 95%CI: 1.82-2.68; p≤0.00001, respectively). 2. Participation in physical education was not significantly associated with likelihood of engaging in high levels of inactivity. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Individuals using a recreation center were 75% more likely to fall in the highest category of moderate-vigorous physical activity (AOR: 1.75; 95%CI: 1.56-1.96; p≤0.00001).	Not Reported
Author Lumeng, Appugliese (2006) AR, CA, MA, KS, NC, PA, VA, WA, WI	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 3-10 year-olds, 85% White, 9% Black, 6% Other, 10% Child 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. Parental perception of safety in the neighborhood **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Diverse land use mix 2. Perceptions of neighborhood aesthetics 3. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic 4. Access to walking and biking facilities **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-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 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. 2. Parent concerns, neighborhood aesthetics, and stores within a 20-minute walk were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR= 5.2, 95%CI 2.71-9.96, p<0.05, aesthetics; OR=2.5, 95% CI=1.33-4.80, p<0.05, store distance; OR= 3.2, 95%CI= 1.68-6.01, p<0.05). 3. A parental concerns scale was most strongly associated with child active commuting (OR=5.2, 95% CI= 2.71-9.96, p<0.05). 4. Parent concerns and neighborhood aesthetics were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR=4.9, 95% CI=2.54-9.40, p<0.05, aesthetics; OR=2.4, 95% CI=1.23-4.56, p<0.05). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Parent concerns, neighborhoods aesthetics, and stores within a 20-minute walk were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR= 5.2, 95%CI =2.71-9.96, p<0.05, aesthetics; OR=2.5, 95% CI=1.33-4.80, p<0.05, store distance; OR= 3.2, 95%CI= 1.68-6.01, p<0.05). 2. Parent concerns and neighborhood aesthetics were independently associated with active commuting (parent concerns; OR=4.9, 95% CI=2.54-9.40, p<0.05, aesthetics; OR=2.4, 95% CI=1.23-4.56, p<0.05). (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resource may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. In high-income neighborhoods, more children actively commute in high-walkable (34%) than in low-walkable neighborhoods (23%), but no differences are noted in low-income neighborhoods.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Doyle, Kelly-Schwartz (2006) United States	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, Urban, Mean age= 46.8 (±20.03), 32% Non-Hispanic White, 28% Non-Hispanic Black, 33% Mexican American Income/poverty level: mean=2.41, SD=1.81 (5-point scale, ratio of income to poverty level, higher score=higher income) (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 safety <u>MULTI-COMPONENT:</u> 1. Neighborhood walkability including: number of intersections, connectivity, number of roads, and street connectivity **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Street Design** <u>OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY:</u> 1. Individuals who live in counties that are more walkable and have lower crime rates tended to walk more and to have lower body mass indices (BMIs) than people in less walkable and more crime-prone areas, even after controlling for a variety of individual variables related to health (walkability; coefficient= -0.054, standard error=0.028, p<0.05, crime; coefficient= -2.00, standard error=4.20, not significant). <u>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY:</u> 2. Individuals who live in counties that are more walkable and have lower crime rates tended to walk more than people in less walkable and more crime-prone areas (coefficient=0.053, standard error=0.020, p<0.01 for walkability, crime not significant). (Note: The walkability scale was measured using street connectivity, block size, and accessible routes.)	1. Among lifelong residents of an area, lesser walkability and more crime were also associated with respondents reporting weight related chronic illness (diabetes and hypertension; walkability coefficient= -0.001, standard error=0.011and crime coefficient= -0.978, se=1.70) and lower ratings of their own health (self-rated; walkability coefficient= 0.006, standard error= 0.006 and crime coefficient=0.692, se=0.80, physician health; walkability coefficient=0.031,se=0.025, and crime coefficient=-0.910, se=2.80, no significant association).

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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 2. Land-use mix 3. Street connectivity and alternative routes COMPLEX: 1. Perceptions of social support **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Community Design** 1. Stores within easy walking distance of home was 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). **Safety-Traffic** CHAMPS BASELINE AND INTERVENTION; 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, 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. 3. In Oregon, the neighborhood traffic and crime-related safety subscale reached statistical significance (F for interaction term= 5.9[1,117], p=0.016). **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).	1. Seeing or speaking with others when walking in one's neighborhood was positively associated with minutes per week of moderate-and/or-vigorous intensity physical activity at the Stanford (parameter estimate=70.4(93), p=0.009, R^2=13.3) and Atlanta sites (parameter estimate=59.3(218), p=0.029, total R^2=6.7), while seeing or speaking with others when walking in the neighborhood was positively associated with minutes per week of walking for errands at the Stanford (parameter estimate=0.46(93), p=0.02, total R^2=15.6) and Memphis sites (parameter estimate=0.25(73), p=0.05, total R^2=26.0).
Author Bennett, McNeill (2007) Massachusetts	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, Urban, Lower income, 94.8% Minority: 43.6% Black, 5.2% White, 42.1% Hispanic, 9.1% Other; 26.8% Men, 73.2% 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 was provided. 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	Not Reported	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author King, Castro (2000) United States	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Female, Adults, 40 years of age and older, 26.4% White, 25.6% Black, 25.3% American Indian/ Native Alaska, 22.7% Hispanic , 60% reported annual household income < $35,000 (evaluation sample) White, Adult, Female (comparison 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 safety from crime and unattended dogs **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	1. Females reporting frequent observations of others exercising in their neighborhood were associated with more physical activity (OR=1.26, 95%1.06-1.50, p<0.01). 2. Females who were more self-conscious about their appearance were more likely to be physically active (OR=1.08, 95% CI=1.01-1.14, p<0.05). 3. Females reporting that they were too tired (OR=0.92, 95% CI=0.85-0.99, p<0.05), lacked energy (OR=0.90, 95% CI=0.84-0.97, p<0.01), and not in good health (OR=0.93, 95% CI=0.86-0.99, p<0.05) were less likely to be physically active. 4. (n=653) By using regression analyses three of the variables achieved statistical significance for American Indian–Alaskan Native: overall model, $\chi^2(28, N = 653) = 60.6, p < 0.0003$. Education (OR=1.21, 95% CI=1.02-1.44, p<0.05) and being self-conscious about physical appearance were positively associated with physical activity while reporting that an individual was not in good health (OR=0.83, 95%CI=0.70-0.97, p<0.05) was negatively associated with physical activity. 5. Females reporting the presence of hills (OR=1.46, 95% CI=1.22-1.75, p<.001) and enjoyable scenery (OR=1.42, 95% CI=1.12-1.79, p<0.01) in their neighborhoods were more likely to be physically active. 6. Through regression analyses four variables were found to be significantly associated with White women and physical activity; age and lack of energy (OR=0.78, 95% CI= 0.67-.92, p<0.01) were negatively associated with physical activity, while education and the presence of hills in the neighborhood (OR=1.48, 95% CI=1.04-2.10, p<0.05) were positively associated with physical activity. These results showed the same direction of effect described for the total sample: overall model, $\chi^2(28, N = 712) = 76.7, p < 0.0001$. 7. Four of the variables entered into the regression model for the Hispanic subgroup achieved statistical significance: overall model, $\chi^2(28, N = 622) = 64.8, p < 0.0001$. The presence of hills in one's neighborhood (OR=1.89, 95% CI=1.21-2.93, p<0.01), discouragement from others about exercise (OR=1.25, 95% CI=1.03-1.51), and education were positively associated with physical activity, while being too tired (OR=0.78, 95% CI=0.66-0.92, p<0.01) was negatively associated with physical activity.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
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 safety from crime and unattended dogs MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 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-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).	1. 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). 2. 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).
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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 2. Access to places 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-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. **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).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author McDonald (2008) California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults, 44 (± 16) years, Lower income 100% Minority: 49% African American, 26% Asian, 20% Latino, and 5% other nonwhite (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. Influence of neighborhood crime **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Forsyth, Hearst (2008), Forsyth, Oakes (2007), Oakes, Forsyth (2007) Minnesota	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 65% Female, 81% Caucasian (evaluation sample)	**Representative** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Study participants appear relatively homogenous with respect to SES but heterogeneous with respect to density and street connectivity. The northern sector of the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area was chosen for its environmental diversity. **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Perceptions of neighborhood safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to transit 2. Street network and residential density 3. Access to places for physical activity 4. Density and land-use mix 5. Traffic calming devices COMPLEX: 1. Social 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. There are small positive correlations between mean and median accelerometer counts of total physical activity with straight-line and network distances to the nearest video store, hardware store, and pharmacy, although not to other destinations. Park distance was negatively correlated with accelerometer readings, however while the values were significant they were low (results not shown). 2.There are very few correlations with the 3 measures of total physical activity and these are all negative correlations with measures of retail (accelerometer mean; CE; -0.3488) and commercial uses (accelerometer mean; CE; -0.3473) ($p<0.05$). 3. Notably absent were any positive correlations with mixed use-apart from a modest one with miscellaneous retail (CE; 0.3505, $p<0.05$). 4.High density areas have twice the odds of increased travel walking as low density areas (OR=1.99; 95%CI 1.29, 3.06). For the negative binomial model the odds ratio was 1.47, ($p<0.10$). 5. (N=511 IPAQ; N=709 Diary) Leisure walking was negatively correlated with social land uses (IPAQ CE; -0.5067) and tax exempt land uses (IPAQ CE; -0.4214), (both $p<0.05$). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1.Block size has no effect on travel walking. 2. Larger blocks seem to increase odds ratios for leisure walking by about 40% (OR=1.40; 95%CI=0.96, 2.05). 3. Total walking in mean miles per day is positively correlated with sidewalks (length per unit area; CE; 0.4510; length divided by road length; CE; 0.3449), ($p<0.05$). 4. (N=511 IPAQ; N=709 Diary) Leisure walking was negatively correlated with sidewalks (length/road IPAQ CE; -0.3318) and connected street patterns (IPAQ # access points CE; -0.3349; IPAQ connected nodes CE; -0.3643), (all $p<0.05$). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. (N=511 IPAQ; N=709 Diary) Leisure walking was negatively correlated with some of the same features; transit (IPAQ CE; -0.4882; Diary CE; -0.3360, $p<0.05$). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Using Spearman's correlations there was significant positive association with accelerometry physical activity and whether people spoke to others in their neighborhood, perceptions of crime, having places to go in walking distance from their home, hills, nearness to book stores and participant's job, and access to bicycle and pedestrian paths (although significant, r values were low with the highest being r=0.13 for closeness to job or school) (results not shown). **Safety Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Total walking in mean miles per day is positively correlated with traffic calming (CE; 0.3629, $p<0.05$).	Not reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Catlin, Simoes (2003) Missouri	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 71% White, 27.3% Black, 1.8% other ethnicity, 35.2% overweight, 23.9% obese, 52% female (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 criminal safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to facilities for physical activity (indoor and outdoor, trails, parks) 2. Access to sidewalks and shoulders 3. Perceptions of traffic safety **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** 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). **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: 1.06-2.28) 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.)	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).
Author Jago, Baranowski (2006); Jago, Baranowski (2005) Texas	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Male, 10-14 year olds (mean age=12.8), 69% Anglo-American, 3.3% African-American, 18.6% Hispanic, 9.1% other ethnicity (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 safety from crime and unattended dogs MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Street connectivity and intersection density 2. Access to parks **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. Only sidewalk characteristics were associated with physical activity, with a positive association with light intensity physical activity (r=0.204, p=0.003) and a negative association with sedentary behavior (r= -0.199, p=0.004). 2. In the spatial regression model, sidewalk characteristics were significantly negatively associated with minutes of sedentary activity (t= -2.70, p=0.008), while age was positively associated (t= 2.25, p=0.025). 3. Sidewalk characteristics were positively (t= 2.85, p=0.005) and age negatively (t= -2.74, p=0.007) associated with minutes of light-intensity physical activity. 4. Walking and cycling ease was positively associated with tidiness (r=0.198, p=0.004) and negatively associated with street access and condition (r= -0.197, p=0.005). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Walking and cycling ease was positively associated with parks (r= -0.136, p=0.05)..	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Wen, Kandula (2007) California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 18 years and older, 63% White, 6.4% Black, 17% Hispanic, 8.6% Asian, 4.4% other and 13% lower income (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 and park safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to parks and playgrounds in the neighborhood COMPLEX: 1. Neighborhood social cohesion **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. Neighborhood access to a park, playground, or open space (OR=1.26, 95% CI=1.16, 1.36) were both significantly associated with walking at recommended levels. 2. Access to a park, playground, or open space was positively correlated with walking at recommended levels among White (OR=1.29, 95% CI= 1.15-1.45; p<0.001), Black (OR=1.64, 95% CI= 1.16-2.32; p<0.001) and Hispanic (OR=1.21, 95% CI= 1.02-1.44, p<0.05) respondents, but not with Asian respondents.	1. Social cohesion was positively associated with walking at recommended levels among Whites (OR=1.06 95% CI=1.01, 1.12, p<0.001) and Hispanics (OR=1.14 95% CI=1.02, 1.27, p<0.05). 2. Neighborhood social cohesion (OR=1.09, 95% CI=1.04, 1.14) was significantly associated with walking at recommended levels.
Author Burdette, Whitaker (2004) Ohio	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 3-4 year-olds 100% Lower-income 76% Black, 23% White (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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Proximity to nearest playground 2. Distance to fast food restaurants **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Neighborhood Availability of Restaurants** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. There was no difference in mean distance to fast food restaurant when comparing children with a BMI ≥95th percentile to those with a BMI<95th percentile (fast food: t=0.70 and 0.69, respectively, p=0.91) and when comparing children with a BMI ≥ 85th percentile to those with a BMI < 85th percentile (fast food: t=0.69 and 0.70, respectively, p=0.43). 2. There was no significant correlation between children's BMI z scores and distance to the nearest fast food restaurant. 3. When comparing overweight and non-overweight children, there was no difference in the percentage living in neighborhoods without fast food restaurants (44.0% vs. 44.5%, p=0.84). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. There was no difference in mean distance to the nearest playground when comparing children with a BMI ≥95th percentile to those with a BMI<95th percentile (playground: t=0.31 both, p=0.77) and when comparing children with a BMI ≥ 85th % to those with a BMI < 85th percentile (playground: t=0.31 both, p=0.32). 2. There was no significant correlation between children's BMI z scores and distance to the nearest playground. 3. When comparing overweight and non-overweight children, there was no difference in the percentage living in neighborhoods without playgrounds (3.3% vs. 4.1%, p=0.29).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Babey, Hastert (2008) California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 12-17 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. Perceptions of safe parks MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to open spaces and parks **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. Stratified analyses revealed that access to a safe park was positively associated with regular activity (relative risk [RR]= 1.10, 95% CI= 1.01-1.17, p<0.05) and negatively associated with inactivity (RR=0.58, 95% CI= 0.39-0.86, p<0.01) for adolescents in urban areas, but not rural areas. 2. In stratified analyses, adolescents with access to a safe park were less likely to be inactive than those without access for example; (1) adolescents living in apartments (RR= 0.52, 95% CI= 0.28-0.96, p<0.05) but not houses, (2) adolescents living in neighborhoods perceived as unsafe (RR= 0.47, 95% CI= 0.23-0.93, p<0.05) but not those living in safe neighborhoods, and (3) adolescents from lower-income (RR= 0.62, 95% CI=0.39-0.97, p<0.05) but not higher income families. However, access to a safe park was not significantly associated with regular activity for these groups.	Not Reported
Author Gomez, Johnson (2004) Texas	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Urban, Hispanic, 11-13 year olds (target) 94% Mexican-Americans, 2% non-Hispanic Whites, 3% African-Americans, and 1% Other ethnicity, 97.7% minority, Annual income ranged from $3927 to $15,887 (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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to recreational facilities 2. Distance to facilities **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. As distance to the nearest open play area increased, outdoor physical activity (OPA) for boys decreased significantly (β=-0.317, T= -2.823, p=0.006). **Availability to Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. As distance to the nearest open play area increased, OPA for boys decreased significantly (β=-0.317, T= -2.823, p=0.006). (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. Stepwise multiple regression analysis for the entire group revealed none of the environmental factors were significantly associated with outdoor physical activity (OPA).

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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to parks 2. Neighborhood perceptions of traffic safety **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**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). **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 Suminski, Poston (2005) Midwestern United States	**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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 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	**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 ($p<0.01$). **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 (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 ($p<0.01$). **Street 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) or 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: Environmental features includes construction/integrity of sidewalks and streets, neighborhood traffic volume and speed, lighting, crime, aesthetics, availability of shops, parks, work, and schools. Neighborhood safety is a composite measure of; construction/integrity of sidewalks and streets, neighborhood traffic volume and speed, lighting, crime.)	1. 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.

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 safety and crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of safety from traffic 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	**Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. With the baseline data, there was not a statistically significant relationship 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 neighborhood safety to physical activity (gamma =0.01). **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). 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
Author Adkins, Sherwood (2004) Minnesota	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Female 8-10 year olds, average age:8.8[±0.9], 100% identified themselves as African-American; Parent composition: African-American (83%), biracial (4%), and white (13%) (evaluation sample).	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional or descriptive data provided Perceptions of neighborhood safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to facilities for physical activity COMPLEX: 1. Social factors (self-efficacy and family support) **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 neighborhood safety and access to facilities for physical activity, as reported by the parent and daughter and the family environment reported by the parent, were not related to girl's activity level.	1. BMI was inversely correlated with moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (r= -0.35, p<0.01), whereas parent's self-efficacy for supporting their daughter to be active was positively correlated with activity (r=0.45, p<0.001). 2. There was a trend for parent's reported support of daughter's activity level to be associated with activity (r= 0.26, p<0.06).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Handy, Cao (2008); Handy, Cao (2006) California	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, General population, Urban, Suburban (target 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 safety (crime) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to physical activity resources in the community 2. Distance to places of business and land-use diversity 3. Street connectivity and neighborhood aesthetics **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. Objective measures for minimum distance to a bank (coefficient=0.082, p=0.035), number of banks within 800m (coefficient=0.091, p=0.005), and number of types of businesses within 1600m (coefficient=0.073, p=0.040) were positively associated with increased walking. 2. Individuals living in mixed-use neighborhoods (coefficient=0.0471, p=0.017) and living farther from health clubs (coefficient=0.0561, p=0.004) had higher neighborhood physical activity. 3. Individuals with higher perceptions of stores within walking distance (coefficient=0.0549, p=0.004) engaged in neighborhood physical activity more frequently. 4. Respondents who preferred to be physically active (coefficient=0.118, p=0.004) and had stores within walking distance (coefficient=0.168, p<0.001) walked to the store more frequently. After controlling for effects, distance to potential destinations, both objective (coefficient=-0.144, p,0.001), and perceived (coefficient=0.268, p<0.001) remained positively associated with neighborhood walking. 5. The current number of household maintenance businesses within 1600 m (coefficient=0.090, p=0.012) and the minimum distance to a health club had (coefficient=0.071, p=0.045) positive effects on changes in biking. 6. A significantly higher share of residents in traditional neighborhoods reported walking to a store at least once in the last 30 days compared to suburban neighborhoods (data not shown). Over 86% of residents in traditional neighborhoods strolled at least once in the last 30 days versus 79% of residents in suburban neighborhoods, with an average frequency of 10.1 strolls compared to 7.7 strolls. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Larger blocks seem to increase odds ratios for leisure walking by about 40% (OR=1.40; 95%CI 0.96, 2.05, p-value not reported). 2. Total walking in mean miles per day is positively correlated with sidewalks (length per unit area; CE; 0.4510; length divided by road length; CE; 0.3449), street lights (CE; 0.4874), traffic calming (CE; 0.3629), and several of our many measures of connected street patterns (signs vary) (p<0.05). 3. Travel walking measured both by survey and diary was positively correlated with sidewalks (length per unit (lpu)/IPAQ; CE; 0.4866; lpu Diary; CE; 0.6224; length/road(l/r) IPAQ; CE; 0.5282; l/r Diary; CE; 0.5945), transit (IPAQ; CE; 0.3716, Diary; CE; 0.4652), litter/graffiti (IPAQ; CE; 0.3325; Diary; CE; 0.5238) and connected street patterns (# access pts./IPAQ; CE; 0.5176, # pts/ Diary; CE; 0.5384; intersections IPAQ; CE; 0.4052, int. Diary; CE; 0.5279; 4-way IPAQ; CE; 0.4602; 4-way Diary; CE; 0.5782; nodes IPAQ; CE; 0.4284, nodes Diary; CE; 0.4673; ratio 4-way IPAQ; CE; 0.4164, 4-way Diary; CE; 0.4698) (all p<0.05). 4. Leisure walking was negatively correlated with transit (IPAQ CE; -0.4882; Diary CE; -0.3360), sidewalks (length/road IPAQ CE; -0.3318), street lights and connected street patterns (IPAQ # access points CE; -0.3349; IPAQ connected nodes CE; -0.3643). 5. Changes in perceptions of attractiveness (NPA coefficient=0.151, p<0.01) were associated with increased neighborhood physical activity and walking. 6. Individuals with higher perceptions of attractiveness (coefficient=0.0866, p<0.001) engaged in neighborhood physical activity more frequently. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Individuals with higher perceptions of physical activity options (coefficient=0.0395, p=0.083) engaged in neighborhood physical activity more frequently. 2. Changes in perceptions of physical activity options (NPA coefficient=0.0586, p=0.046; walking coefficient=0.103, p<0.001) were associated with increased neighborhood physical activity and walking. 3. The minimum distance to a health club (coefficient=0.071, p=0.045) had positive effects on changes in biking	1. Travel-minimizing attitude (coefficient=-0.077, p=0.014), pro-transit attitude (coefficient=-0.121, p<0.001), and preference for spaciousness (coefficient=-0.111, p=0.002) were all negatively associated with changes in biking, while attractiveness preference (coefficient=0.074, p=0.019) was positively associated. 2. Changes in perceptions of socializing (NPA coefficient=0.0549, p=0.052; walking coefficient=0.14, p<0.001) were associated with increased neighborhood physical activity and walking. 3. Compared to suburban residents, residents in traditional neighborhoods perceived their neighborhoods on average as having higher attractiveness (mean=0.28 vs. mean=-0.33, p<0.01). Residents in suburban neighborhoods on average perceived their neighborhoods as having greater outdoor spaciousness (mean=0.06 vs. mean=-0.05, p=0.02). 4. Individuals with higher perceptions of the social environment (coefficient=0.0447, p=0.026) engaged in neighborhood physical activity more frequently.

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 safety from crime 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, aesthetically pleasing environment 4. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 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	**Safety-Traffic** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: *Stratified Analysis:* 1. Neighborhood perceptions of feeling unsafe from crime (OR=2.09, 95%CI= 1.5-2.92, p<0.05) was associated with being obese. 2. Neighborhood perceptions of feeling unsafe from traffic (OR=2.46, 95%CI= 1.63-3.71, p<0.05) was associated with being obese/inactive. **Neighborhood Availability of Food Stores** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. The availability and quality of fresh fruits and vegetables was not significantly associated with obesity. Further distance to the nearest supermarket was associated with increased odds of obesity (OR: 1.8, 95% CI= 1.3-2.4). **Street Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Having no sidewalks or shoulders on most streets was not significantly associated with obesity. 2. Neighborhood perceptions 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) and having an unmaintained community (OR=1.48, 95%CI=1.09-1.99) were all 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. **Community Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Furthest distance (>20 minutes) to the nearest recreational facility (OR=2.74, 95% CI= 1.68-4.48) was associated with being obese. 2. 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. 3. Having 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. 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. 5. 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. (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 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. Neighborhood physical disorder MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Residential density and land-use mix 2. Neighborhood traffic safety 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-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. **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. (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 $p<0.05$).

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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to recreational facilities 2. Perceptions of traffic safety 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. Adolescent and parent report multivariate regression models revealed that positive estimates were found for street connectivity and pedestrian infrastructure in relation to the number of sites to which adolescents walked/biked. **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. Only adolescents reported higher land-use mix and street connectivity (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. **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Adolescents who usually walked/biked to at least 5 sites reported higher land-use mix (no statistics). 2. 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. 3. 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 Zenk, Wilbur (2009) Illinois	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable On average, participants completed 38.1% of the prescribed walks, including an average of 44.5% and 28.8% of the prescribed walks for the enhanced intervention group and minimal intervention group, respectively (t=-3.487, p=0.001). **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Environmental data only collected cross-sectionally. 40-65 year olds, African-American, Females, Urban and Suburban; 100% 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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access and availability of places for leisure activity 2. Neighborhood land-use mix 3. 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. Neighborhood walkability and recreational open space were not statistically significantly associated with adherence to walking prescriptions. There was no evidence that the environment moderated the effect of intervention group on adherence (results not shown). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood walkability was not statistically significantly associated with adherence to walking prescriptions. There was no evidence that the environment moderated the effect of intervention group on adherence (results not shown). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Neighborhood walkability and aestheticswere not statistically significantly associated with adherence to walking prescriptions. There was no evidence that the environment moderated the effect of intervention group on adherence (results not shown). (Note: The measure representing walkability score was a composite for multiple strategy with variables related to access of facilities and open spaces, aesthetics, safety, and connectivity.)	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Sharpe, Granner (2004) South Carolina	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, General population, 63.1% White, 36.9% African-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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to sidewalks in good condition 2. Access to places 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. Prior to adjustment, significant associations with physical activity included perceived condition of neighborhood sidewalks for walking or jogging (data not shown). 2. After adjustment, odds ratios remained significant for perceived condition of neighborhood sidewalks for walking or jogging (OR=2.04, 95%CI: 1.25-3.35, p<0.05). While the presence or absence of a sidewalk on at least one side of neighborhood streets was not significantly associated with greater odds of meeting the physical activity recommendation, the perception of well-maintained neighborhood sidewalks among the 27.6% of respondents who reported the presence of sidewalks in their neighborhoods was significantly associated with physical activity (adjusted OR=2.04, 95%CI: 1.25-3.35). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. General linear models were computed. For both unadjusted and adjusted models, the odds of meeting the physical activity recommendation were greater for higher numbers of known routes for walking or jogging in the county (least squares mean=1.41, F=5.28, p=0.02); numbers of known routes for bicycling in the county (least squares mean=0.58, F=9.45, p<0.01); number of days in a typical month respondents used a public track, trial, pathway, or mapped-out route for any type of physical activity (least squares mean =3.51, F=34.74, p<0.01); and number of days in a typical month respondents used public parks and other outdoor recreation areas for any type of physical activity (least squares mean=2.79, F=23.92, p<0.01) [statistics all from adjusted general linear model].	1. The odds ratios for gender, race, and across levels of age and income were significantly associated with decreased likelihood of meeting physical activity recommendations (data not shown). 2. Prior to adjustment, significant associations with physical activity included knowledge of mapped-out bicycling routes in the county; knowledge of mapped-out routes for walking or jogging on sidewalks or beside roadways in the county; and some worksite supports (data not shown). 3. After adjustment, odds ratios remained significant for worksite-provided sports teams (OR=1.30, 95%CI: 1.02-1.64, p<0.05). 4. Prior to adjustment, significant associations with physical activity included knowledge of mapped-out bicycling routes in the county and knowledge of mapped-out routes for walking or jogging on sidewalks or beside roadways in the county (data not shown). 5. After adjustment, odds ratios remained significant for knowledge of mapped-out bicycling routes in the county (OR=1.39, 95%CI: 1.10-1.76, p<0.05) and knowledge of mapped-out walking or jogging routes in the county (OR=1.33, 95%CI: 1.09-1.62, p<0.05).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Hoehner, Brennan (2005) Missouri and Georgia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 18 to 96 years old, 63.6% White, 32.6% Black, 3.8% other minority (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. Presence of physical disorder in the neighborhood MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to diverse land use 2. Access to public transit 3. Condition and presence of sidewalks 4. Access to places for physical activity **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. People in the highest quartile for the total number of non-residential destinations were two to three times more likely to engage in any transportation activity (OR=3.5, 95%CI: 2.3-5.5) or meet recommendations (OR=3.3, 95%CI: 2.0-5.4) through transportation activity than respondents in the lowest quartile ($p<0.05$ for trend). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Those in the top quartile for street segments of bus stops were 1.5 times more likely to engage in transportation activity (95%CI: 1.0-2.3) and 1.6 times more likely to meet recommendations through transportation activity (95%CI: 0.99-2.6) compared to those in the lowest quartile as assessed by the audit ($p<0.05$ for trend). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Levelness of sidewalks as assessed by the audit showed a significant negative association (OR=0.6, 95%CI: 0.4-0.9) for engaging in any transportation activity and with meeting recommendations (OR=0.5, 95%CI: 0.3-0.8) through transportation activity ($p<0.05$ for trend). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Those who agreed that they had many places to exercise in their community and who reported more facilities within a 5-minute walk were slightly more likely to meet recommendations, but the direction of the trends and significance of the associations at different levels of these measures were inconsistent (data not shown).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Heinrich, Lee (2008); Heinrich, Lee (2007) Midwest United States	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 18-93 years old, 100% Lower income	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Access to safe places to be physically active MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Street networks and quality of neighborhood features **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. Neighborhoods with greater connectivity had residents with lower average BMI (r=-0.58, p=0.05). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 2. Greater neighborhood street connectivity (β=0.672, p=0.001) and fewer average incivilities per neighborhood (β=-0.54, p=0.005) were associated with more days walked per week [F=21.8 (2,11); p<0.001; R^2=0.83]. 3. Higher street connectivity (β=0.902, p=0.001) and fewer physical resources were correlated with meeting moderate physical activity guidelines [F=39.18 (2,11); p<0.001; R^2=0.90). 4. Having greater street connectivity was linked to a 1.2 to 3.3 greater chance of meeting moderate physical activity guidelines (OR=1.987, 95%CI: 1.21-3.263, p=0.007). 5. Greater street connectivity resulted in 1-2 more days walked per week (OR=1.553, 95%CI: 1.105-2.183, p-0.011). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. At the aggregated neighborhood level (n=12), 71% of the variance in obesity prevalence was accounted for by accessibility (β=-1.02, p=0.05), average feature quality (β=1.05, p=0.09), average number of amenities per resource (β=-1.19, p=0.03), and average incivilities per resource (β=0.70, p=0.04), (F(4,11) 4.32, p<0.05). 2. Male gender and increased quality of features (F(11,407)37.19 and 12.66, p<0.001) predicted lower BMI among residents. 3. A statistically significant relationship was found between both the number of amenities per resource and obesity prevalence (r=-0.61, p=0.04) and amenity quality and obesity prevalence (r=-0.60, p=0.04). 4. As resource accessibility increased obesity prevalence decreased (r=-0.51, p=0.09). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 5. A greater percent of accessible physical activity resources (β=0.584, p=0.046) was related to the number of days vigorous physical activity was performed during the past week [F=5.17 (2,11); p<0.05; R^2=0.34]. 6. Higher street connectivity (β=0.902, p=0.001) and fewer physical resources were correlated with meeting moderate physical activity guidelines [F=39.18 (2,11); p<0.001; R^2=0.90).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Cohen, Ashwood (2006) Washington DC, Maryland, South Carolina	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 11-13 year old females	**Representative** Not Applicable **Potential Population Reach** Not Applicable **Potential High Risk Popluation Reach** Not Applicable	**Intervention Components** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Presence of street lights MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to parks and amenities 2. Presence of shaded areas 3. Distance to neighborhood parks **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. For the average girl having 3.5 parks within a 1-mile radius of home, accounted for an additional 68 minutes of non-school 3.0 MET MVPA and an additional 36.5 minutes of non-school 4.6 MET MVPA per 6 days. 2. For every park, regardless of type, within a half mile radius from home there was an increase in non-school MVPA by 33 minutes for 3.0 METs (coefficient estimate=0.02, p<0.005) and 17.2 minutes for 4.6 METs (coefficient estimate=0.03, p=0.04) per 6 days. Each additional park past the half-mile increased non-school MVPA by 12 minutes for 3.0 Mets (coefficient estimate=0.01, p<0.009) and 6.7 minutes for 4.6 Mets (coefficient estimate=0.01, p=0.09) per 6 days. 3. For the linear model, having either a neighborhood or community park within a half-mile of home was associated with 45.5 more 3.0 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.03, p<0.05) and 24.2 more 4.6 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.04; p<0.05) per 6 days. In the half-mile to 1-mile distance, MVPA increased by 29.6, 3.0 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.02, p<0.05) and 18.6, 4.6 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.03; p<0.05) per 6 days. 4. Additional non-school MVPA minutes increased when girls had neighborhood/community parks (3.0 MET 42 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 22 min, p<0.05), mini-parks (3.0 MET 92 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 40 min; p<0.10), natural resource areas (3.0 MET 36 min, p<0.05), walking paths (3.0 MET 59 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 13 min; p<0.05), and running tracks (3.0 MET 208 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 82 min; p<0.05) within a half mile of their homes. 5. Playgrounds (39 min for 3.0 MET; 28 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.05 for both), basketball courts (37 min for 3.0 MET, p<0.10; 30 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.05), multipurpose rooms (13 min for 3.0 MET and 4.6 MET, p<0.05 for both), park offices (14 min for 3.0 MET, p<0.10), an ice rink (28 min for 3.0 MET, p<0.10), a running track (208 min for 3.0 MET, p<0.05), a swimming area (32 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.05), and an amphitheater (16 min for 3.0 MET, p<0.10) were associated with increased MVPA. 6. Lawn games (-161 min for 3.0 MET, p<0.05; -55 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.10) and skateboard areas (-94 min for 3.0 MET; -48 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.05 for both) were negatively associated with increased MVPA. 7. Special use parks were negatively associated with both 3.0 MET and 4.6 MET MVPA (each p<0.05). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. For the average girl having 3.5 parks within a 1-mile radius of home, accounted for an additional 68 minutes of non-school 3.0 MET MVPA and an additional 36.5 minutes of non-school 4.6 MET MVPA per 6 days. 2. For every park, regardless of type, within a half mile radius from home there was an increase in non-school MVPA by 33 minutes for 3.0 METs (coefficient estimate=0.02, p<0.005) and 17.2 minutes for 4.6 METs (coefficient estimate=0.03, p=0.04) per 6 days. Each additional park past the half-mile increased non-school MVPA by 12 minutes for 3.0 Mets (coefficient estimate=0.01, p<0.009) and 6.7 minutes for 4.6 Mets (coefficient estimate=0.01, p=0.09) per 6 days. 3. For the linear model, having either a neighborhood or community park within a half-mile of home was associated with 45.5 more 3.0 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.03, p<0.05) and 24.2 more 4.6 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.04; p<0.05) per 6 days. In the half-mile to 1-mile distance, MVPA increased by 29.6, 3.0 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.02, p<0.05) and 18.6, 4.6 MET minutes (coefficient estimate=0.03; p<0.05) per 6 days. 4. Additional non-school MVPA minutes increased when girls had neighborhood/community parks (3.0 MET 42 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 22 min, p<0.05), mini-parks (3.0 MET 92 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 40 min; p<0.10), natural resource areas (3.0 MET 36 min, p<0.05), walking paths (3.0 MET 59 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 13 min; p<0.05), and running tracks (3.0 MET 208 min, p<0.05; 4.6 MET 82 min; p<0.05) within a half mile of their homes. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Shaded areas (20 min for 3.0 MET; 14 min for 4.6 MET, p<0.10 for both) were associated with increased MVPA. (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
International						
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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to transit stations 2. Access to destinations, land-use, road network distance 3. Access to sidewalks and neighborhood aesthetics 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	**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 OR=1.49, 95%CI: 0.96-2.33). **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 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=3.0, 95%CI: 2.04-4.4, p<0.001). *(continued next page)*	1. 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). 2. 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=1.37m 95%CI: 0.83-2.25) test for trend p<0.001). 3. 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: 1.0-2.15, p=0.048). 4. 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).

					Street Design OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Overweight individuals were more likely to live on highways (OR=4.24; 95%CI: 1.62-11.09), 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). 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). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. 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). 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. 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). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Residing within 1500 meters 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. 5-10 year olds, 11-13 year olds, 14-18 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 neighborhood safety (incivilities and personal safety) MULIT-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of traffic safety **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Increased level of concern among adolescent girls about road safety was negatively associated with girls moderate to vigorous physical activity (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). 2. 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]. 3. 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). 4. 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.	Not Reported
Author Kirby, Levesque (2007) Canada (Moose Factory Island)	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults in an Aboriginal Community 130 women (mean age 35.6 years ±12.3), 133 men (mean age=36.3 years ±12.7) (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 safety for walking in the community MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Neighborhood aesthetics **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. The square root of aesthetics was significantly related to total weekly walking ($p<0.05$; $\beta=0.186$ respectively). 2. Hierarchical regressions revealed that perceived environmental variables (e.g., convenience, safety, aesthetics) were not related to the variation in response for all intensity, strenuous, moderate, and light physical activity ($p>0.05$).	1. Total weekly physical activity involvement decreased with increasing BMI (χ^2 (4, N=253)=11.72, p=0.02) and total weekly walking decreased with increasing BMI (χ^2 (4, N=253)=19.59, p=0.001). 2. Hierarchical regressions revealed that perceived environmental variables were not related to the variation in response for all intensity, strenuous, moderate, and light physical activity ($p>0.05$).

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 safety from crime and vandalism MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 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-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 to this being a serious problem. **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 De Bourdeaudhuij, Sallis (2003) Belgium	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. Adults,18-65 year olds (target sample) 41 ± 12.22 (mean) years, 48.3% Female, 70.1% Employed, 39.3% Urban dwellers, 54.9% Suburban, 5.9% Countryside (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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Street connectivity and quality and access to sidewalks and bike lanes 2. Access to shops, residential density, land use mix 3. Access to physical activity facilities 4. Access to transportation stops **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. Greater availability of sidewalks in the neighborhood was associated with walking in males (semi-partial correlate; 0.14, p≤0.05). **Community Design** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY 1. Participants with a higher BMI reported fewer convenient physical activity facilities (Pearson r=0.11, p<0.05). PHYSICAL ACTIVITY 2. In males, vigorous intensity physical activity was related to more convenient physical activity resources (semi-partial correlate, 0.11, p<0.05). In females, vigorous intensity physical activity was related to more convenient physical activity facilities (semi-partial correlate; 0.14, p≤0.05) and supportive worksite environment was related to more high intensity activity (semi-partial correlate; 0.12, p≤0.05). 3. In females, more walking was associated with greater ease of the walk to public transportation stops (semi-partial correlate; 0.16, p≤0.05) and to longer distances to shops and businesses (semi-partial correlate; 0.15, p≤0.05). 4. In males, moderate intensity activity was related to more satisfaction with neighborhood services (semi-partial correlate; 0.15, p≤0.05). In females, more moderate intensity physical activity was related to better access to shopping in local stores (semi-partial correlate; 0.16, p≤0.05) and more emotional satisfaction with the neighborhood (semi-partial correlate; 0.13, p≤0.05). SEDENTARY BEHAVIOR 5. In males, the amount of sitting was related to higher perceived criminality in the neighborhood (semi-partial correlate; -0.22, p≤0.01), longer distances to shops and businesses (land use mix, diversity) (semi-partial correlate; 0.14, p≤0.05), and more convenience of shopping in local stores (land use mix, access to local shopping) (semi-partial correlate; 0.15, p≤0.01). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY 1. In males, vigorous intensity physical activity was related to more convenient physical activity facilities (semipartial correlate; 0.11, p≤0.05). In females, vigorous intensity physical activity was related to more convenient physical activity facilities (semi-partial correlate; 0.14, p≤0.05) and supportive worksite environment was related to more high intensity activity (semi-partial correlate; 0.12, p≤0.05). **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY 1. In females, more walking was associatd with greater ease of the walk to public transportation stops (semi-partial correlate; 0.16, p<0.05).	1. For females, less emotional satisfaction with the neighborhood was associated with greater amounts of sitting (semi-partial correlate= -0.15, p≤0.05).

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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Residential density and land use mix-diversity 2. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 3. Street connectivity and neighborhood 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	**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 and street connectivity. 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) and for individuals with parks in the area compared to those without (26.2 ± 6.4 vs. 2.7 ± 6.9; 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 the aesthetics score (mean ± standard error: 20.6 ± 6.0 vs. 0.6 ± 6.7; p<0.05) and 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 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), 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. 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. 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). **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. 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). (Note: Multiple GIS and perception measures were used to determine respondent's walkability score.)	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Miles (2008) Europe	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. General Population (target sample) 48 years old (median age), 65% 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 safety from crime **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	Not Reported
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 perceptions of safety (dogs barking) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 2. Land-use mix 3. Access to open spaces (beaches and parks) 4. Neighborhood aesthetics 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	**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). **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). **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). 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). **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 waking (20 minutes or 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). (Note: The practical environment is a composite of access to shops, parks and beaches.)	1. 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.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Li, Dibley (2006) China	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 11-17 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. Perceptions of safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to recreational facilities (playgrounds, gyms, sports equipment, and public open spaces) 2. Access to sidewalks 3. Land-use diversity 4. Acces to physical activity during recess **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. Access to public facilities (OR= 1.4, 95% CI=1.0-1.9, p=0.03 for moderate access and OR= 1.7, 95% CI=1.2-2.4, p<0.01 for difficult access) was positively associated with inactivity. 2. Lack of recreational facilities was associated with a higher percentage of inactivity in girls (OR=2.4, 95%CI= 1.6-3.5, p<0.001). 3. Lack of extracurricular sports (OR= 1.3, 95% CI= 1.1-1.6, p=0.01) and sports meetings (OR= 2.0, 95% CI=1.4-2.9, p<0.01) were significantly associated with physical inactivity, but physical education was inversely associated with inactivity (OR= 3.1, 95% CI=1.6-6.0, p<0.01 for twice a week and OR= 2.6, 95% CI=1.3-5.1, p=0.01 for three times a week). 4. Lack of recess exercise or sports meetings was associated with higher percentages of inactivity in boys (OR=2.2, 95% CI= 1.2-4.0, p=0.02 and OR=1.5, 95% CI= 1.0-2.2, p=0.05, respectively). 5. For boys, lack of class recess sports (OR= 2.2, 95% CI=1.2-4.0, p=0.02) and sports meetings (OR= 1.5, 95% CI= 1.0-2.2, p=0.05) were associated with low levels of physical activity, and boys at schools forbidding bike riding to school were 60% less likely to be inactive (OR= 0.4, 95% CI= 0.2-0.8, p=0.02). 6. For girls, fewer sports meetings (OR= 1.7, 95% CI= 1.03-2.8, p=0.04) was associated with inactivity. 7. Adolescent boys living in surroundings without vacant fields were 1.7 times (95% CI= 1.2-2.5, p=0.01) more likely to be inactive. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Adolescents living in a house without sidewalks were 30% more likely to be inactive (OR= 1.3, 95% CI= 1.0-1.6, p=0.01). 2. Lack of sidewalks around the house was associated with physical inactivity in girls (OR= 1.5, 95% CI= 1.04-2.0, p=0.03). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Unavailability of video game shops around the home was associated with a higher percentage of inactive boys (OR=1.5, 95% CI= 1.1-2.1, p=0.02). **School Physical Activity Policies** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Lack of recess exercise or sports meetings was associated with higher percentages of inactivity in boys (OR=2.2, 95% CI= 1.2-4.0, p=0.02 and OR=1.5, 95% CI= 1.0-2.2, p=0.05, respectively). 2. For boys, lack of class recess sports (OR= 2.2, 95% CI=1.2-4.0, p=0.02) and sports meetings (OR= 1.5, 95% CI= 1.0-2.2, p=0.05) were associated with low levels of physical activity, and boys at schools forbidding bike riding to school were 60% less likely to be inactive (OR= 0.4, 95% CI= 0.2-0.8, p=0.02).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Utter, Denny (2006) New Zealand	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data was provided. 13-17 year olds No racial/ethnic demographics given.	**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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Accessibility of community-based recreational facilities and physical activity resources **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. Students were significantly less likely to engage in activity if they perceived there was nothing to do where they lived (OR=0.78, 95% CI= 0.7-0.9). 2. Students were significantly more likely to engage in regular vigorous activity when they lived within walking distance of the following perceived community features: a park (OR=1.17, 95% CI= 1.1-1.3), a skateboard ramp (OR=1.32, 95% CI: 1.2-1.5), a sports field (OR=1.59, 95% CI: 1.4-1.8), a swimming pool (OR=1.38, 95% CI: 1.2-1.5), a gym (OR=1.44, 95% CI: 1.3-1.6), and a bicycle track (OR=1.44, 95% CI: 1.3-1.6). (Note: students could respond yes to more than one facility.) **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Students were significantly more likely to engage in regular vigorous activity when they lived within walking distance of the following perceived community features: a park (OR=1.17, 95% CI= 1.1-1.3), a skateboard ramp (OR=1.32, 95% CI: 1.2-1.5), a sports field (OR=1.59, 95% CI: 1.4-1.8), a swimming pool (OR=1.38, 95% CI: 1.2-1.5), a gym (OR=1.44, 95% CI: 1.3-1.6), and a bicycle track (OR=1.44, 95% CI: 1.3-1.6). (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 Hume, Salmon (2007) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 10-year-olds, Lower 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 neighborhood safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to neighborhood destinations 2. Perceptions of traffic safety 3. Street connectivity and aesthetic environment 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). 2. Among girls, the perceptions of nice houses in the neighborhood (β=2.98, p=0.003) and nice neighborhood house gardens (β=1.91, p=0.03) were significantly positively associated with walking frequency. Only easy to walk/cycle and lots of grafitti remained significantly associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (both p<0.05). **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 remained significantly associated with walking frequency in the multiple regression model (both p<0.05). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Among girls, the perceptions of nice houses in the neighborhood (β=2.98, p=0.003) and nice neighborhood house gardens (β=1.91, p=0.03) were significantly positively associated with walking frequency.	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 grafitti 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).

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 safety (unattended dogs) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to sports facilities 2. Access to convenience stores 3. Neighborhood perceptions of traffic safety 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-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1.Girls' perception 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). **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** PHYISCAL 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 Kamphuis, Van Lenthe (2008) The Netherlands	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 25-75 years old Compared with higher educational groups, people in the lowest education group were more likely to be female, and to be born in a country other than the Netherlands. (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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to places for physical activity 2. Neighborhood aesthetics COMPLEX: 1. Social disorder and support **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. Having insufficient places to go (OR=1.16, not significant) increased the likelihood of not participating in sports. **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Unattractive neighborhoods (OR=1.45, 95%CI: 1.2-1.75, p<0.001) increased the likelihood of not participating in sports.	1. People indicating not feeling at home in their neighborhood (OR; 1.26, CI; 1.07-1.48, p=0.018) were also more likely to do no sports, but this was not significantly prevalent among any of the educational groups (p=0.093). 2. Having a small social network (OR=1.23, 95%CI: 1.05-1.45, p=0.006) and low social cohesion (OR=1.17, 95%CI: 1-1.38, p<0.001) increased the likelihood of not participating in sports. 3. In the full model, two neighborhood factors (safety and social cohesion), three household factors (material deprivation [crowding] and social deprivation [going out fortnightly and going on holiday yearly], and nine individual factors (six outcome expectancies, social support modeling, self-efficacy, and intention) remained statistically significant. Compared with the basic model, all factors together reduced the odds of doing no sports among the lowest educational group by 57% (OR=2.29, 95%CI: 1.7-3.07), for the second-lowest by 48% (OR=1.62, 95%CI: 1.34-1.96), and for the second-highest by 26% (OR=1.48, 95%CI: 1.23-1.78).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Duncan, Mummery (2005) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. General population, Ages 18 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 provided. Neighborhood safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to opportunities for physical activity 2. Street connectivity 3. Distance to opportunities for physical activity 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. People with the most proximal parkland beyond a network distance of 0.6 kilometers (km), were 41% more likely to achieve recommended levels of activity than those with parkland within this distance (OR=1.41, CI=1.01-1.97). 2. Euclidian distance of 0.4 km from their home were 69% less likely to walk in the previous week than those who had a footpath within that distance from their place of residence (OR=0.31, CI=0.18-0.55). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. People who had unacceptable route directness to the nearest parkland were 41% more likely to achieve sufficient levels of activity than those people who had acceptable route directness to parkland (OR=1.41, CI=1.00-1.98). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. People who did not agree that the neighborhood footpaths were in good condition were 38% more likely to participate in recreational walking than those who thought the footpaths were in good condition (OR=1.38, CI=1.00-1.91). 2. People with the most proximal parkland beyond a network distance of 0.6 k, were 41% more likely to achieve recommended levels of activity than those with parkland within this distance (OR=1.41, CI=1.01-1.97). 3. Euclidian distance of 0.4 km from their home were 69% less likely to walk in the previous week than those who had a footpath within that distance from their place of residence (OR=0.31, CI=0.18-0.55). (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. People reporting high levels of self-efficacy were 93% more likely to attain sufficient activity than those people reporting low levels of self-efficacy (OR=1.93, CI=1.40-2.64). 2. People reporting high levels of social support for activity were 65% more likely to participate in recreational walking than those people who reported low levels of social support [OR=1.65, CI=(1.17-2.34)]. [Note: p-values not provided.]

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Mota, Gomes (2007) Portugal	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable General population, Urban, 11-18 year olds, average age: 14.7 (±1.6) 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 provided. Perceptions of neighborhood safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Neighborhood aesthetics 2. Access to recreation facilities COMPLEX: 1. Social environment **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. In girls, access to recreational facilities (Rho = 0.10, p≤0.02) and was positively associated with lesiure time physical activity (LTPA). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Logistic regression analysis (data not shown) showed that girls who agreed that "there are many interesting things to look at while walking in my neighborhood" were more likely to be LTPA (OR = 1.59, 95% CI = 1.07–2.34, p ≤ 0.02). 2. In girls, access to aesthetics features (Rho= 0.12, p≤0.006) was positively associated with LTPA.	1. Social environment for boys (Rho= 0.11, p≤0.05) and girls (Rho = 0.08, p≤0.02) showed to be significantly associated with LTPA.
Author Mota, Gomes (2007) Portugal	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 13-18 year old females	**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 neighborhood safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Street connectivity **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. For neighborhood environment characteristics, only street connectivity was significantly different between the travel groups. 56.0% of active vs 46.1% of passive travelers agreed that there were many 4-way intersections in their neighborhood (p=0.02). Girls who agreed that there were many four-way intersections in their neighborhood were more likely to be active travelers (OR=1.63, 95%CI=1.08-2.45, p≤0.05).	1. No statistically significant differences were seen for screen time between active vs. passive travel groups.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Santana, Santos (2008) Portugal	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, General Population, 53.5% female, 46.5% male (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 safety (property crime) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to gymnasiums and swimming pools **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. Vigorous physical activity was negatively associated with lack of gymnasiums (OR=1.17, 95%CI: 1.01-1.36, p<0.05) and swimming pools (OR=1.17, 95%CI: 1.01-1.35, p<0.05).	1. Strong positive associations were found between moderate physical activity and social cohesion (OR=1.28, 95%CI: 1.09-1.52, p<0.05) and availability of public health services (OR=1.38, 95%CI: 1.14-1.66, p<0.05). 2. Vigorous physical activity was negatively associated with weaker social cohesion (OR=1.24, 95%CI: 1.01-1.52, p<0.05).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Humpel, Owen (2004) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Adults, 57% Female	**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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to areas for physical activity (beach, lake, facilities) 2. Aesthetic environment 3. Distance to destinations **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. A higher proportion of those with the most positive perceptions for accessibility reported more walking for pleasure (45.2%; χ^2=7.28, p<0.05). 2. Participants reporting that a beach/lake was within easy walking distance reported significantly more neighborhood walking minutes (M=224) than did those reporting a beach/lake was not within walking distance (M=139; F(2,379)=11.0, p<0.001); significantly more exercise walking (M=163 compared to M=100 minutes; F(2,382)=9.72, p<0.01); and significantly more walking for pleasure compared to those perceiving that a beach/lake is not within walking distance (M=33 and M=21, respectively; F(2,380)=3.88, p<0.02). 3. For men, accessibility of facilities for walking demonstrated a negative relationship with neighborhood walking (for high walkers: OR=0.30; 95% CI 0.09-0.91; p<0.05). 4. Women with moderately positive perceptions about accessibility were more than three times more likely to walk for pleasure (OR=3.51; 95% CI 1.64-9.15, p<0.01). 5. A higher proportion of those with the most positive perceptions for all four environmental perception categories reported more neighborhood walking (data not shown). 6. Significantly higher proportions of those walking for exercise were found among those with the most positive perceptions for all four environmental perception categories (results not shown). **Street Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Higher proportions of neighborhood walkers were found among those with high perceptions for aesthetics (66.7%; χ^2=17.08, p<0.001). 2. Men with the most positive perceptions about the aesthetic nature of the environment were more than seven times more likely to be high neighborhood walkers (OR=7.43; 95%CI 1.92-28.82; p<0.05). 3. Men with a high score on aesthetics were nearly four times as likely to walk for exercise (OR=3.86; 95%CI 1.03-14.46; p<0.05). 4. A higher proportion of those with the most positive perceptions for all four environmental perception categories reported more neighborhood walking (data not shown). 5. Significantly higher proportions of those walking for exercise were found among those with the most positive perceptions for all four environmental perception categories (results not shown). **Community Design** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Participants reporting that a beach/lake was within easy walking distance reported significantly more neighborhood walking minutes (M=224) than did those reporting a beach/lake was not within walking distance (M=139; F(2,379)=11.0, p<0.001); significantly more exercise walking (M=163 compared to M=100 minutes; F(2,382)=9.72, p<0.01); and significantly more walking for pleasure compared to those perceiving that a beach/lake is not within walking distance (M=33 and M=21, respectively; F(2,380)=3.88, p<0.02). (Notes: Environmental perceptions were based on aesthetics, accessibility, safety, and weather. Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. No significant differences in proportions were found for walking to get from place to place. 2. Participants living in coastal locations (mean [M]=189 minutes) walked significantly more minutes in their neighborhood (F(1,382)=5.10, p<0.05) than did participants in noncoastal locations (M=149 minutes).

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. Access to streetlights (safety) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Neighborhood aesthetics 2. Access to places for physical activity 3. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic 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 (physical features, aesthetic features, facilities) contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity. 2. The proportion of unique variation (Nagelkerke R2) 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 R2=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 (facilities) contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity. **Transportation** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Environmental variables (transit) contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity. **Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. Environmental variables (traffic) contributed the least to vigorous intensity activity. 2. The proportion of unique variation (Nagelkerke R2) 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 in 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 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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Levels of urbanization 2. Perceptions of traffic safety 3. Neighborhood aesthetics 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	**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 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). **Community 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. TThe degree of urbanization altered the relationship between the environment score and walking to work (data not reported). 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 Traffic** 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 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, 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.)	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%.

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Prezza, Pilloni (2001) Italy	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. Urban, Middle-class, 7-12 year olds (average age=9.41 years), 53% Male, 26.3% were only children (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 interpersonal safety MULTI-COMPONENT: Not reported COMPLEX: 1. Social support **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	Not Reported	1. Children who moved around their own neighborhood with greater autonomy and played without always being closely supervised by adults met with peers to play more often (partial r between independent mobility and play with peers=0.37, p<0.001; between school errands atonomy and play with peers=0.37, p<0.001). 2. Children whose mothers had stronger neighborhood relations played more often with peers (p<0.001), in particular with neighborhood children (p<0.001), and they exchanged more visits with friends (p<0.001). 3. After adding environmental variables to the multiple regression analysis, child's independent mobility was associated with neighborhood relations (β=0.118, p<0.05), age of neighborhood (β=0.181, p<0.01), living near a park (β=0.179, p<0.01), and living near a courtyard (β=0.379, p<0.001); child's autonomy in home-school route and in errands was associated with living near a courtyard (β=0.296, p<0.001); and child's play with peers was associated with safety perception(β=-0.13, p<0.05) and neighborhood relations (β=0.191, p<0.01).

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Lee, Kawakubo (2006) 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 safety from crime MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Perceptions of neighborhood traffic safety 2. Street connectivity (alternate routes to locations) 3. Access to parks and trails 4. Distance to destinations within the neighborhood **Feasibility** Not Applicable **Implementation Complexity** Not Applicable	**Population Impact** Not Applicable **High-risk Population Impact** Not Applicable **Sustainability** Not Applicable	**Safety-Traffic** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. 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). **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. 3. In the high walkable region, those who had high scores for "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 time walking. **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. 2. 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. **Community Design** 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. 2. 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. (Note: Distance to nearest PA resource and access to nearest PA resources may overlap in their designated strategy categories.)	1. 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). 2. 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 Veugelers, Sithole (2008) Nova Scotia, Canada	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-13 year olds, 10.8% Lower-income (income <20,000) [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 safety MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to shops and stores with fruits and vegetables 2. Neighborhood access to parks, playgrounds and recreational facilities 3. Access to stores (mixed land-use) **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. Children in neighborhoods with good access to shops were 26% less likely to be overweight (OR=0.74. 95% CI=0.60-0.91) and 33% less likely to be obese (OR=0.67, 95% CI=0.48-0.94) than children from neighborhoods with poor access to shops. NUTRITION: 2. Children in neighborhoods with the best access to shops (highest one-third) reported more consumption of fruits and vegetables (incremental risk [IR]=1.04, 95% CI: 1.00-1.09), substantially less consumption of dietary fat (IR=0.51, 95% CI: 0.33-0.78), and a higher diet quality index (IR=2.26, 95% CI: 1.09-4.69) in comparison to neighborhoods with the poorest access to shops (lowest one-third). **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Children in neighborhoods with good access to playgrounds and parks were 24% less likely to be overweight (OR=0.76, 95% CI=0.62-0.95) and 29% less likely to be obese (OR=0.71, 95% CI=0.53-0.99) than children in neighborhoods with poor access. 2. Children in neighborhoods with good access to recreational facilities were 29% less likely to be overweight (OR=0.71, 95% CI=0.56-0.90) and 42% less likely to be obese (OR=0.58, 95% CI=0.40-0.84) than children in with poor access. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 3. Children in neighborhoods with good access to playgrounds, parks and recreational facilities engaged more in sports with a coach than children in neighborhoods with poor access. (IR=1.64, 95% CI: 1.38-1.95; IR=1.76, 95% CI: 1.47-2.12, respectively). SEDENTARY BEHAVIOR: 4. Children in neighborhoods with good access to playgrounds, parks and recreational facilities spent less time in front of a computer or TV screen than children in neighborhoods with poor access (IR=0.72, 95% CI: 0.62-0.84; IR=0.64, 95% CI: 0.55-0.75, respectively). [no p-values provided] **Neighborhood Availability of Food Stores** OVERWEIGHT/OBESITY: 1. Children in neighborhoods with good access to shops were 26% less likely to be overweight (OR=0.74. 95% CI=0.60, 0.91) and 33% less likely to be obese (OR=0.67, 95% CI=0.48, 0.94) than children from neighborhoods with poor access to shops. NUTRITION: 2. Children in neighborhoods with the best access to shops (highest one-third) reported more consumption of F&V (incremental risk [IR]=1.04, 95% CI= 1.00, 1.09), substantially less consumption of dietary fat (IR=0.51, 95% CI= 0.33, 0.78), and a higher diet quality index (IR=2.26, 95% CI= 1.09, 4.69) in comparison to neighborhoods with the poorest access to shops (lowest one-third).	Not Reported

Study Description	Population	Reach	Intervention	Impact & Sustainability	Other Results	Related Benefits & Consequences
Author Stafford, Cummins (2007) England and Scotland	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 16 years and older, General population (targeted 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 disorder (crime) MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to street facilities 2. Land-use diversity, urban sprawl, and population density **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. For population density, the corresponding mean difference in BMI was 0.36 kg/m^2 and for supermarkets it was 0.44 kg/m^2 (results not shown). 2. Population density was inversely associated with waist-to-hip ratio (coefficient =-0.041, $p<0.05$), indicating that average waist-to-hip ratios were lower in more densely populated areas. 3. Resident's BMI was negatively associated with high street facilities (coefficient= -0.033), and proximity to a post office (coefficient= -0.019) ($p<0.05$ for both).	1. Comparing the 75th and 25th percentile of average sports participation, mean BMI was 0.23 kg/m^2 lower in places with greater participation.
Author Timperio, Giles-Corti (2008) Australia	**Participation/ Potential Exposure** Not Applicable **High-Risk Population** Not Applicable Only cross-sectional data provided. 5-18 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. Perceptions of safety from unguarded dogs MULTI-COMPONENT: 1. Access to and features associated with public open spaces near the home 2. Neighborhood aesthetics **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. Adolescent girls had more moderate-to-vigorous physical activity after school if their closest public open space had trees that provided shade (β= 5.8 min/day, $p<0.01$) **Availability of Parks, Playgrounds, Trails, and Recreation Centers** PHYSICAL ACTIVITY: 1. There were no associations between any features of the child's closest public open space and younger boys' moderate-to-vigorous physical activity after school. 2. The presence of playgrounds was positively associated with younger boys' weekend moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (β=24.9 min/day; $p<0.05$). 3. The number of recreational facilities was inversely associated with younger girls' moderate-to-vigorous physical activity after school (β= -2.6 min/day, $p<0.05$) and on the weekend (β= -8.7 min/day, $p<0.05$). 4. There were no associations between any features of the closest public open space and adolescent boys' moderate-to-vigorous physical activity after school. 5. There were no significant associations between public open space features and adolescents boys' or girls' moderate-to-vigorous physical activity on the weekend.	Not Reported