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Heart disease, cancer, diabetes, and stroke are the most common causes of illness, disability, and death affecting a growing number of Americans.\(^4\) Many of these chronic conditions tend to be more common, diagnosed later, and result in worse outcomes for particular individuals,\(^5-7\) such as people of color, people in low-income neighborhoods, and others whose life conditions place them at risk for poor health.

(See Appendix A for list of population groups experiencing chronic disease disparities.)

Despite decades of efforts to reduce and eliminate health disparities, they persist—and in some cases, they are widening among some population groups.\(^8-11\) Such disparities do not have a single cause. They are created and maintained through multiple, interconnected, and complex pathways. Some of the factors influencing health and contributing to health disparities include the following:\(^12,13\)

- **Root causes or social determinants of health** such as poverty, lack of education, racism, discrimination, and stigma.
- **Environment and community conditions** such as how a community looks (e.g., property neglect), what residents are exposed to (e.g., advertising, violence), and what resources are available there (e.g., transportation, grocery stores).
- **Behavioral factors** such as diet, tobacco use, and engagement in physical activity.
- **Medical services** such as the availability and quality of medical services.
INTRODUCTION (Continued)

HEALTH EQUITY MEANS THAT EVERY PERSON HAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO ACHIEVE OPTIMAL HEALTH REGARDLESS OF:

- THE COLOR OF THEIR SKIN
- LEVEL OF EDUCATION
- GENDER IDENTITY
- SEXUAL ORIENTATION
- THE JOB THEY HAVE
- THE NEIGHBORHOOD THEY LIVE IN
- WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE A DISABILITY

While health disparities can be addressed at multiple levels, this resource focuses on policy, systems, and environmental improvement strategies designed to improve the places where people live, learn, work, and play. Many of the 20th and 21st century’s greatest public health achievements (e.g., water fluoridation, motor vehicle safety, food safety) have relied on the use of laws, regulations, and environmental improvement strategies. Health practitioners play an important role in these improvements by engaging the community, identifying needs, conducting analyses, developing partnerships, as well as implementing and evaluating evidence-based interventions.

These intervention approaches are briefly described below:

- **Policy improvements** may include “a law, regulation, procedure, administrative action, incentive, or voluntary practice of governments and other institutions.”
  
  Example: A voluntary school wellness policy that ensures food and beverage offerings meet certain standards.

- **Systems improvements** may include a “change that impacts all elements, including social norms of an organization, institution, or system.”
  
  Example: The integration of tobacco screening and referral protocols into a hospital system.

- **Environmental improvements** may include changes to the physical, social, or economic environment.
  
  Example: A change to street infrastructure that enhances connectivity and promotes physical activity.
Such interventions have great potential to prevent and reduce health inequities, affect a large portion of a population, and can also be leveraged to address root causes, ensuring the greatest possible health impact is achieved over time. However, without careful design and implementation, such interventions may inadvertently widen health inequities. To maximize the health effects for all and reduce health inequities, it is important to consider the following:

- Different strategies require varying levels of individual or community effort and resources, which may affect who benefits and at what rate.

- Certain population groups may face barriers to or negative unintended consequences from certain strategies (see Appendix B for a list of common barriers). Such barriers can limit the strategy’s effect and worsen the disparity.

- Population groups experiencing health disparities have further to go to attain their full health potential, so even with equitable implementation, health effects may vary.

- Health equity should not only be considered when designing interventions. To help advance the goal, health equity should be considered in other aspects of public health practice (e.g., organizational capacity, partnerships, evaluation).

*A Practitioner’s Guide to Advancing Health Equity* provides lessons learned and practices from the field, as well as from the existing evidence-base. This resource offers ideas on how to maximize the effects of several policy, systems, and environmental improvement strategies with a goal to reduce health inequities and advance health equity. Additionally, the resource will help communities incorporate the concept of health equity into core components of public health practice such as organizational capacity, partnerships, community engagement, identifying health inequities, and evaluation.

This resource has four major sections:

- Incorporating Health Equity into **Foundational Skills** of Public Health

- Maximizing **Tobacco-Free Living** Strategies to Advance Health Equity

- Maximizing **Healthy Food and Beverage** Strategies to Advance Health Equity

- Maximizing **Active Living** Strategies to Advance Health Equity
A clear understanding of definitions is important. The following definitions are offered as a starting place as you think through this issue and review this resource:

**Health equity:** Health equity is attainment of the highest level of health for all people. Achieving health equity requires valuing everyone equally with focused and ongoing societal efforts to address avoidable inequalities, historical and contemporary injustices, and the elimination of health and health care disparities.\(^2\)

**Health disparities:** Health disparities are differences in health outcomes and their determinants between segments of the population, as defined by social, demographic, environmental, and geographic attributes.\(^7\)

**Health inequalities:** Health inequalities is a term sometimes used interchangeably with the term health disparities. It is more often used in the scientific and economic literature to refer to summary measures of population health associated with individual- or group-specific attributes (e.g., income, education, or race/ethnicity).\(^7\)

**Health inequities:** Health inequities are a subset of health inequalities that are modifiable, associated with social disadvantage, and considered ethically unfair.\(^7,18,19\)

**Social determinants of health:** Social determinants of health are conditions in the environments in which people are born, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that affect a wide range of health, functioning, and quality-of-life outcomes and risks.\(^20\)
Rural areas, low-income communities, and communities of color are most affected by limited access to healthful food and beverages. Limited access to healthful foods makes it particularly difficult to make healthy choices in these environments. Addressing inequities in healthy food and beverage environments may help address many chronic disease health disparities.

The Healthy Food and Beverage section of *A Practitioner’s Guide for Advancing Health Equity* provides equity-oriented considerations, key partners, and community examples related to the design and implementation of the following strategies:

- Community Food Retail Environment
- Healthy Restaurants and Catering Trucks
- Healthy Food in School, Afterschool, and Early Care and Education Environments
- Food Access through Land Use Planning and Policies
- Breastfeeding Practices and Policies

The content presented is not exhaustive and is not intended to act as a “how-to” guide. Rather, this section is meant to stimulate ideas for ensuring healthy food and beverage strategies are designed to address the needs of populations experiencing health inequities. Refer to the disclaimer on page iii when using this Section.
COMMUNITY FOOD RETAIL STRATEGIES CAN INCREASE ACCESS TO HEALTHY FOOD OR DECREASE ACCESS TO UNHEALTHY FOODS IN LOCAL STORES, SUPERMARKETS, FARMERS’ MARKETS, AND OTHER FOOD RETAIL OUTLETS. SUCH STRATEGIES MAY INCLUDE DEVELOPING FULL-SERVICE GROCERY STORES, IMPROVING OFFERINGS IN SMALL STORES, AND STARTING OR EXPANDING FARMERS’ MARKETS.

MAKE THE CASE:
Why Is This A Health Equity Issue?
The issues below highlight the need for community food retail strategies that advance health equity:

- **Limited Access to Healthy Food in Underserved Communities**: Differences in geographic food access have been documented in several national studies. For example, low-income communities, communities of color, and rural areas have been found to have fewer supermarkets than wealthier communities, predominantly white neighborhoods, and urban areas.

- **Additional Barriers Exist for Many Underserved Communities in Accessing Healthy Food**: Barriers to accessing healthy foods may include dependence on public transit, difficulty transporting groceries due to lack of reliable transportation, and lack of access to healthy options that reflect cultural food preferences. Additionally, higher costs of healthy foods, and low-quality food selection in some communities may serve as barriers.

- **Improving Access to Healthful Food Can Provide Opportunities for Economic Development in Underserved Communities**: Strategies that increase access to healthy food in underserved communities can have positive effects beyond improved nutrition. Such strategies may create jobs, revitalize commercial areas, and provide tax revenues. For example, grocery stores may act as anchors for retail developments, spurring local economic development.
Design and Implement with Health Equity in Mind

To maximize health impact and advance health equity, consider these factors and others when designing, implementing, and evaluating community food retail strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>BARRIERS OR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **COMMUNITY AWARENESS & INVOLVEMENT** | Ensure community engagement in and awareness of healthy food retail projects | • Engage populations experiencing health inequities in community food assessments, GIS mapping, and other efforts to assess food access.  
• Ensure those selected for food policy councils and other food initiatives designed to improve the food environment have an understanding and the capacity to address health disparities affecting certain population groups.  
• Increase residents’ awareness of new healthy food retailers, incentives for purchasing healthy foods (e.g., Double Up Food Bucks program[109]), and healthy food preparation. |
| **AFFORDABILITY** | Ensure affordable pricing for healthy food options and increase low-income residents’ purchasing power | • Promote the use of food assistance programs (e.g., Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and the Women, Infant, and Children’s Program (WIC)) at healthy food retailers.\(^1\)  
• Lower retail costs by supporting efforts that encourage lower prices (e.g., streamlining distribution, facilitating bulk purchasing by multiple stores).\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^3\)  
• Provide support to increase demand of healthy options (e.g., assist with marketing and displaying food) and reduce food waste due to spoilage (e.g., offer ways to store and refrigerate foods).\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^3\)  
• Increase SNAP participant purchasing power by providing incentives for the purchase of healthy food (e.g., Double Up Food Bucks program[109]). |
| **NEGATIVE PERCEPTIONS & LIMITED CAPACITY** | Provide support for bringing food options to underserved communities | • Find mechanisms to support healthy food retailers who locate in underserved communities (e.g., simplify applications and permit procedures, bundle land to encourage supermarkets to locate in both affluent and low-income areas).  
• Provide support to help stores sell healthier options (e.g., staff training in handling perishable items, free local advertising). |

---

Decisions about food availability may not reflect the needs and desires of community residents including perceptions of what is culturally appropriate.

Low-income communities and communities of color may have higher food prices for healthy food than high-income and white communities.\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^4\) Additionally, healthy food retailers may not accept SNAP and WIC as forms of payment.

A barrier to attracting healthy food retailers to underserved communities may include perceptions that businesses may suffer financially due to poor customer base, theft, or safety issues. Additionally, small stores may lack space, equipment, or staff expertise to carry fresh produce or to handle perishable foods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>BARRIERS OR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**        | Retailers in underserved communities may not understand how they can support and enhance local economic development. | • Connect local agriculture and food production directly to local markets to help keep food dollars in the community.  
• Establish workforce development programs to train local residents for high-quality jobs in a variety of food retail settings.[1475]  
• When making decisions about food retail, consider developing criteria to support businesses that contribute to local economic development (e.g., commitment to hire local residents). |
| **TRANSPORTATION NEEDS**        | Individuals who live in communities with poor access to healthy food retail and depend on public transit may have more difficulty transporting groceries—especially perishables and bulk packages. Even if affordable healthy food outlets are nearby, lack of transportation may prevent residents from accessing them. | • Increase connectivity between transit and healthy food retail by assessing and improving existing routes.  
• Develop safe pedestrian connectors that provide a direct link between food outlets and nearby transit.  
• In rural areas, and for populations with limited mobility (e.g., the elderly, people with disabilities), consider offering vanpools or shuttles to healthy food options.  
• Provide online ordering and home delivery of healthy options for customers with transportation limitations. |
| **SAFETY & CONCERNS OF VIOLENCE** | Community violence, real or perceived, may be a barrier to shopping at healthy food retail in low-income communities. | • Consider violence prevention strategies to create safe routes and/or reduce concerns of safety on the way to healthy food destinations.  
• See *Preventing Violence Strategy* in Active Living Section of this guide. |
Build the Team: Partnership for Success

Successful efforts to implement community food retail strategies depend on bringing a diverse set of partners to the table early, consistently, and authentically. These partners may include the following:

- Area Agencies on Aging
- Community development, revitalization, and redevelopment agencies and organizations
- Community members (of diverse abilities, ages, cultures, gender, income levels, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation)
- Developers
- Food banks
- Health care systems, hospitals, community clinics, and health care providers
- Housing agencies
- Industry leaders
- Leaders and community champions from multiple sectors
- Local farmers and regional food distributors
- Organizations serving populations experiencing health inequities
- Public health agencies
- Public Works Department
- Retailers and vendors
- Social service agencies
- Zoning and Planning organizations
Corner Store Initiative Supports Community Health and Local Store Owners

Philadelphia, PA

The driving force for a citywide healthy corner store effort came about when school leadership expressed concerns that healthy food policies in schools might drive students to purchase less healthy snacks at nearby corner stores. What started out as a small-scale initiative by The Food Trust to increase the availability of healthy foods, has grown from 10 corner stores near schools to over 600 corner stores in low-income neighborhoods. Results from the Healthy Corner Store Initiative have brought health benefits not only to students, but also community residents who depend primarily on corner stores for food. These efforts have been supported by CDC’s Communities Putting Prevention to Work and Community Transformation Grant programs, as well as other non-federal funding.

Health equity is a central tenet of the corner store efforts. Using existing relationships with local grocers associations (including mom-and-pop store owners), community groups, and school advocates, The Food Trust succeeded in establishing credibility with local corner store owners, making it easier to cultivate new relationships and get buy-in and support. By having a constant presence in the community and working closely with store owners to figure out good solutions, The Food Trust staff created a program that was viable and profitable for the owners. For example, the menu approach taken includes whole foods (e.g., whole-grain tortillas, beans, tofu) and low-fat dairy products, in addition to fresh produce. This allows store owners to select options that fit the store’s capacity, while being culturally appropriate for customers. Additionally, the program gave more stores a modest incentive to participate and allowed them to see the potential for increasing their profits. The process helped store owners see themselves as part of the community. The Food Trust is also focused on identifying sustainable solutions and offering additional supports for the most dedicated stores, such as cost-free training and technical assistance and larger infrastructure renovations (e.g., shelving, refrigeration) to accommodate more healthy food options.

Through this initiative, The Food Trust was able to build a meaningful program that continues to benefit store owners and increases availability of healthy food for many low-income neighborhoods throughout Philadelphia.
Southwest Georgia

The residents of Baker County in southwest Georgia (80% of whom are African American) live in a rural food desert. Over time, grocery store retailers abandoned the area, making it difficult for low-income residents with limited transportation to access healthy foods. The lack of grocery stores also impacted economic vitality in the community, leaving local farmers struggling to maintain their livelihood. To simultaneously address the resulting food access and economic issues, the East Baker Historic Society (EBHS) and the Southwest Georgia Project for Community Education began partnering with the Georgia StrikeForce Initiative and The Federation of Southern Cooperatives—organizations that assist African American and disadvantaged rural farmers—to repurpose unused public land for farmers’ markets in all 22 counties of the southwest region in Georgia. These efforts were supported by the United States Department of Agriculture and CDC’s Communities Putting Prevention to Work: State and Territorial Initiative.

The farmers’ market development process began with identifying potential land. Next, community members, community-based organizations, local business owners, and government officials including commissioners and community development councils, participated in several strategic planning meetings, lending their input and getting approval to use public land. Disadvantaged farmers were identified and their needs were determined and addressed with training. When the market was ready to open, community activities, such as local high school band performances, were held to attract patrons. Residents with limited transportation now had access to nearby healthy food retail, African American and disadvantaged rural farmers gained customers to purchase their products, and town centers were revitalized with additional foot traffic from farmers’ market customers.

By May 2012, four markets had opened. Southwest Georgia’s food desert is being revived with fresh foods—one farmers’ market at a time.
HEALTHIER RESTAURANTS AND CATERING TRUCKS ARE EXAMPLES OF FOOD AWAY FROM HOME THAT MAY SERVE AS A MAJOR SOURCE OF FOOD IN SOME COMMUNITIES. Strategies to improve food selections in these settings may include promotions at the point-of-purchase, increasing the range of healthy food offerings, and promoting these businesses through media and educational initiatives.

MAKE THE CASE:

Why Is This A Health Equity Issue?

The issues below highlight the need for healthy restaurant and catering truck strategies that advance health equity:

- **Higher Concentration of Full-Service and Fast Food Restaurants in Low- and Middle-Income Communities and Communities of Color:** Low-income and middle-income communities and communities of color have been found to have more full-service and fast food or quick-service establishments compared to high-income communities. Eating away from home in food retail venues such as these has been linked to a variety of poor nutritional and health outcomes.

- **Time and Economic Pressures May Contribute to Reliance on Prepared Food Sources:** While time and economic pressures apply to most households, households with limited income may have a tighter budget for purchasing food. Members of these households may also have limited time because of working multiple jobs or having long commute times. Long distances to access resources may be even more common in rural areas. These time and economic pressures may contribute to individuals relying on quickly prepared food sources found at restaurants and catering trucks.

- **Targeted Marketing to Youth of Color Influences Food Choices:** African American and Latino youth are often the target of ethnically-specific marketing initiatives by various food companies. Targeted marketing may increase the likelihood that youth will prefer and consume food options that may be calorie-dense and nutrient-poor, which may negatively affect their diet, weight, and health.
Design and Implement with Health Equity in Mind

To maximize health impact and advance health equity, consider these factors and others when designing, implementing, and evaluating healthy restaurant and catering truck strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>BARRIERS OR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TRUST & ENGAGEMENT | Retailers, particularly those in underserved communities, may be overlooked for health-promoting initiatives due to cultural barriers and misperceptions about their willingness to participate. | - Identify residents or partners with cultural and community ties to engage and recruit retailers in health-related initiatives.  
- Build trust by helping retailers with various aspects of their business (e.g., training staff, incorporating healthy foods). |
| COST | Many smaller full-service and quick-service restaurants and catering trucks operate on thin margins of profit and may be reluctant to modify menus for fear of losing customers and revenue. | - Suggest changes to food preparation and selection that are not only healthy, but also cost-effective (e.g., offer whole beans in addition to refried beans, switch from lard and margarine to oils). |
| PROMOTION | Some small local businesses may not have marketing budgets to promote healthy food options. | - Encourage business owners to adopt healthy practices by helping them with promotional efforts (e.g., point-of-purchase signs) and advertising (e.g., radio spots, newspaper ads). |
| VARIABLE IMPLEMENTATION & ENFORCEMENT | Nutrient labeling may be burdensome for non-chain restaurants and catering trucks. These establishments may lack standardized recipes and may not have the resources to conduct nutrient analyses. Furthermore, some community members may not be responsive to nutrient labeling. | - Assess whether nutrient labeling is a viable strategy for your community.  
- Find partners to help save on the cost of nutrient analysis.  
- Build customers’ awareness and understanding of nutrient labeling and healthy food options (e.g., use symbols to simplify understanding of nutrient content, offer educational sessions). |
Build the Team: Partnership for Success

Successful efforts to implement healthy restaurant and catering truck strategies depend on bringing a diverse set of partners to the table early, consistently, and authentically. These partners may include the following:

- Community-based organizations working on food systems, health, and/or agriculture
- Community development, revitalization, and redevelopment agencies and organizations
- Community members (of diverse abilities, ages, cultures, gender, income levels, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation)
- Faith-based organizations
- Leaders and community champions from multiple sectors
- Local farmers and regional food distributors
- Public health agencies
- Public Works Department
- Regional or local restaurant associations/ethnic restaurants
- Restaurant and catering truck owners and managers
- Zoning and Planning organizations

HEALTH EQUITY IN ACTION

Carryout Project Brings Healthful Foods to Low-Income Neighborhoods

Baltimore, MD

Low-income African Americans in Baltimore have been found to consume a significant portion of their calories from carryout facilities or restaurants. These findings and others prompted Johns Hopkins researchers to create the Baltimore Healthy Carryout (BHC) project, with the goal of increasing healthy food options. The Baltimore Healthy Carryout intervention was funded by the Diabetes Research and Training Center, University of Maryland and Johns Hopkins University, as well as the Center for a Livable Future at Johns Hopkins University.

Being sensitive to restaurant owners’ concerns that significant changes might drive away customers, BHC adopted a phased approach, implementing improvements over time. BHC staff maintained close contact with the owners, visiting each restaurant at least once a week. Through a series of discussions with community members, BHC staff members were able to gauge which healthy foods customers would want. These discussions guided the restaurant owners toward culturally and seasonally acceptable side options such as collard greens, watermelon, broth-based soup with vegetables, yogurt, and fruit cups. Carryout restaurants eventually began offering healthy combo meals (e.g., a healthy entrée with a healthy side instead of fries, bottled water in place of soda) that matched the price of original combo meals, making them accessible to price-sensitive groups.

BHC also addressed concerns about potential profit loss by helping owners with promotion. Paper menus were replaced by more durable laminated signs. Literacy was considered during menu and poster creation, and images were used on the menus to help customers identify healthy choices. The modified menu boards and posters provided an aesthetic improvement, a co-benefit that business owners appreciated. BHC brought healthful foods to Baltimore residents in a way that supported existing local carryout businesses.
Healthy Hometown Restaurant Initiative

**Louisville, KY**

Many people generally consume a large portion of their calories outside of the home in Louisville, KY. In an effort to promote healthy eating, Louisville Metro Public Health and Wellness (LMPHW), with support from CDC's Communities Putting Prevention to Work program, implemented the Healthy Hometown Restaurant Initiative to encourage restaurants to provide healthier options for their patrons. A voluntary menu-labeling resolution was implemented that included a nutrition analysis of meals with printed calorie information and recommendations for healthier menu choices.

LMPHW learned that the community’s strong social connectedness provided a benefit when trying to get buy-in from restaurant owners. Restaurateurs were most motivated to join if they were approached by individuals they trusted, and if those individuals thought their customers wanted the change.

Initially, LMPHW conducted community surveys through the University of Louisville and local youth, hosted professional cooking demonstrations, and attended business association meetings. These activities helped spread the word about the restaurant initiative to residents and restaurant owners. However, only restaurants located in affluent neighborhoods were responding. To engage restaurant owners in Louisville’s low-income neighborhoods, outreach coordinators conducted in-person visits to restaurants. LMPHW overcame owner hesitation by engaging champions including a neighborhood association and the owner of a local restaurant who had previously signed on to the initiative. The champions spread the word about the Healthy Hometown Initiative and encouraged other restaurateurs to join. Their local outreach led five additional restaurants to join the initiative.
HEALTHY FOOD IN SCHOOL, AFTERSCHOOL, AND EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION ENVIRONMENTS

HEALTHY FOOD AND BEVERAGES STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN MAY INCLUDE THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES (E.G., WELLNESS POLICIES, NUTRITION STANDARDS FOR COMPETITIVE FOODS, WATER AVAILABILITY) IN SCHOOL, AFTERSCHOOL, AND EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION ENVIRONMENTS.

MAKE THE CASE:
Why Is This A Health Equity Issue?
The issues below highlight the need for healthy food and beverage strategies that advance health equity:

- **Low-Income Children May Be More Dependent on Foods Provided in School, Afterschool, and Childcare Settings:** Many children benefit from and rely on meals served in school, afterschool, and childcare settings for much of the food they consume per day. Specifically, many children from low-income households qualify for free or reduced-price meals and participate in food programs such as the National School Lunch Program, the School Breakfast Program, and the Child and Adult Care Food Program. However, some barriers may keep children who qualify for free and reduced-price meal programs from enrolling and benefiting from these services. For instance, lack of information about the application process, language and literacy challenges, lack of cultural sensitivity and appropriateness of the food served, and stigma associated with participating in these programs may serve as barriers to enrollment and participation.

- **Settings May Differ in Their Capacity to Provide Healthy Food Environments:** The quality of food may vary substantially between and within different settings (e.g., school districts, public and private settings). Some settings may be more constrained by limited budgets, and others may have limited facilities in which to prepare and serve food. Additionally, some schools may rely on the revenues generated from competitive foods, including vending sales, to support various school functions and activities. These constraints may contribute to less healthy food environments for children in these settings.
Design and Implement with Health Equity in Mind

To maximize health impact and advance health equity, consider these factors and others when designing, implementing, and evaluating healthy food and beverage strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>BARRIERS OR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIABILITY IN IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td>The resources available to institutions may affect their ability to improve their food environment.</td>
<td>• Provide additional staff training or technical assistance in settings with fewer resources. This assistance may help maximize enrollment in meal programs and preparation of healthy foods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional supports to under-resourced school, afterschool, and childcare settings</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore alternatives for institutions with limited facilities for the preparation and storage of foods/snacks (e.g., develop agreements with nearby institutions to use their facilities, use mobile vending carts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATION</strong></td>
<td>Barriers may keep many eligible children from benefiting from these programs. Additionally, time constraints and lack of sensitivity to cultural and religious food preferences may limit participation in meal programs.</td>
<td>• Make it easier for parents to enroll children by making them aware of eligibility and providing assistance with paperwork in multiple languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce barriers to enrollment and increase overall participation in meal programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Take advantage of automatic or school-wide enrollment options, especially in low-income settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjust the time and length of meals to ensure children have time to get and eat lunch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Train staff to be aware of the cultural backgrounds of students in preparation of a culturally appropriate food menu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STIGMA</strong></td>
<td>Stigma may act as a barrier to participation in meal programs.</td>
<td>• Work with stakeholders to identify efforts to prevent obvious identification of eligible students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take steps to reduce stigma associated with meal programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider avoiding separate lines for competitive foods and food programs. Provide the same food options to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore a cashless point-of-sale system where all students have an account in a database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LACK OF EXPOSURE</strong></td>
<td>Many children may have limited access to and familiarity with healthy foods, particularly children from underserved communities.</td>
<td>• Find opportunities to increase students’ exposure to healthy foods (e.g., farm-to-school partnerships, gardening programs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase exposure to healthy foods</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with schools to serve as sites for farmers’ markets on the weekends or during child pick-up hours to increase healthy food access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider strategies to make healthy options more commonplace (e.g., discourage use of less healthy food as a reward, encourage fundraising activities that include healthy options, offer healthy competitive foods and vending).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Build the Team: Partnership for Success

Successful efforts to implement healthy food and beverages strategies in school, after-school, and childcare environments depend on bringing a diverse set of partners to the table early, consistently, and authentically. These partners may include the following:

- Board of Education members
- Childcare licensing agencies
- Childcare staff
- Community-based organizations such as YMCA, Boys and Girls Club, sports associations, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts
- Community members (of diverse abilities, ages, cultures, gender, income levels, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation)
- Food service managers and staff
- Local chefs
- Leaders and community champions from multiple sectors
- Local food organizations
- Parents and students
- Parks and recreation agencies (for after-school and summer programs)
- Principals
- Public health agencies
- School district administrators
- School Health Councils
- Teachers
- Vendors

HEALTH EQUITY IN ACTION

Tailored Institutional Practices to Increase Access to Healthy Foods in Childcare Centers

Southern Nevada

Many Southern Nevada children lack access to healthful food and opportunities for physical activity. This fact, as well as the childhood obesity rates, prompted the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) to support childcare centers in implementing institutional health-promoting practices and policies. Budgetary constraints spurred the district to explore no- to low-cost sustainable solutions.

With support from CDC’s Communities Putting Prevention to Work program, the SNHD Community Health Division worked with the district’s Division of Nursing to provide training to childcare center staff and one-on-one guidance in developing healthy food and physical activity practices and institutional policies. To ensure these efforts reached the children most in need, the district targeted high-need childcare centers, including casinos and other places with high rates of unemployment and participation in need-based programs.

By March 2012, more than 65 centers had implemented institutional nutrition and physical activity policies informed by a best practice policy drafted by the Health District. Each center was able to craft an institutional policy that was most appropriate for it and most feasible for implementation. This flexibility gave each center ownership over its institutional practices instead of requiring a standardized approach that might not have accounted for each center’s unique level of resources and needs.

Each participating center received a curriculum designed specifically for childcare centers and used it to help establish staff development opportunities. Worth at least four continuing education units (CEUs), the curriculum and related training provided an incentive to each center’s support staff to learn how to promote healthy behaviors. Staff can work toward fulfilling a state law that requires licensed childcare professionals to attain 15 CEUs per year, with at least two of those hours in the areas of childhood obesity, physical activity, nutrition, or wellness. Childcare center staff now have the training, resources, and the incentive to have an impact on childhood obesity in Southern Nevada.
Centralized Kitchen Facilitates Healthy Meals for All Schools

Bibb County, GA

Helping students learn is part of the mission of the Bibb County School Nutrition program. Through collaborative efforts with school nutrition, school administrators, and Title I Home-School Facilitators providing in-kind and other support, Bibb County, GA wanted to remove barriers to healthy food access in schools by encouraging all families to apply for free and reduced-price meals. They also implemented a meal accounting system for all students. The system is intended to reduce stigma and prevent obvious identification of students enrolled in the meal program.

Bibb County also built a centralized kitchen for basic prep work and cooking to ensure that each of the county’s 41 schools could serve healthy meals. The kitchen provides meals made from basic healthy ingredients, using little sugar, salt, and fat and no preservatives. The centralized kitchen has allowed each school to implement healthier food options without investing in significant kitchen equipment or staffing changes.

For example, schools can phase out fryers without purchasing new equipment.

Bibb County already had finishing kitchens in each school, and efforts focused on ensuring that equipment to prepare healthy meals was equitably available across the district. The district intentionally created a standardized menu to ensure that all schools serve healthy options without sacrificing taste, diversity, or appeal. Menu options have included “harvest of the month” items such as fresh beets, sweet potatoes, brussels sprouts, and locally grown strawberries.

Daily vegetarian options feature choices such as black bean empanadas or veggie burgers. For districts that cannot afford a centralized kitchen, Dr. Cleta Long, Director of the Bibb County School Nutrition Program, suggests: “Centralize specific preparation within different schools… one school handles entrees, one school is a bakery, one makes sauce.” By creating a parallel distribution system, districts can still serve fresh, healthy food in every school even when kitchen equipment and staff are limited.
LAND USE PLANNING AND POLICIES TO IMPROVE FOOD ACCESS MAY INCLUDE
ATTRACTING HEALTHY FOOD RETAIL (E.G., SMALL BUSINESSES, MOBILE VENDING),
LIMITING THE DENSITY OF LESS HEALTHY FOOD RETAIL, AND PERMITTING URBAN
AGRICULTURE AND COMMUNITY GARDENS.

MAKE THE CASE:

Why Is This A Health Equity Issue?

The issues below highlight the need for land use planning strategies that advance health equity:

- **Historical Land Use Policies and Practices Have Shaped Community Resources:** Historically, land use strategies, such as zoning regulations, were used to separate residential areas from industrial areas. However, some of these strategies were used to segregate groups of people based on race, ethnicity, or income status. Such land use decisions and other issues have left many low-income and communities of color with limited access to essential services, facilities, and infrastructure, including food resources.

- **Barriers to Healthy Food Options May Exist in Underserved Communities:** The density of fast food outlets has been found to be higher, and the availability of supermarkets is lower, in low-income communities and communities of color. Additionally, low-income communities and communities of color may have higher food prices for healthy food than high-income and white communities. The quality of healthy food may also be lower in these underserved communities. Land use planning and policies can be used to improve the food options in a community.

Note: As many land use and zoning strategies fall in the purview of other sectors, public health agencies should work with appropriate partners when considering such strategies.
Design and Implement with Health Equity in Mind

To maximize health impact and advance health equity, consider these factors and others when designing, implementing, and evaluating land use planning strategies to improve access to healthy food:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>BARRIERS OR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **COMMUNITY AWARENESS & INVOLVEMENT** | Engage residents who lack access to healthy food in planning and policy development | Historically, low-income populations and communities of color have been excluded from, or not actively recruited into, land use planning and policy development.145 | • Partner with organizations that have credibility and ties to residents to foster meaningful engagement.  
• Provide training to build residents’ leadership skills and increase their understanding of the planning process.  
• Establish systematic processes to ensure that resident concerns are gathered and reflected in land use plans when they are updated. |

| **DISPLACEMENT** | Make improvements to food retail in underserved communities with current residents in mind | Economic development including new food retail may result in increases in property values and rent. If such changes occur, existing residents may be displaced if they are unable to afford living there. | • Ensure comprehensive plans outline how improvements in food access will affect other priorities such as housing and jobs (e.g., incentivize local hiring for new food retailers).  
• Align transportation decisions (e.g., transit hub locations, bus routes), with food access needs, particularly for those who may depend on transit (e.g., people with disabilities, the elderly). |

| **DISPROPORTIONATE NEGATIVE EFFECTS** | Be aware that the same methods used to attract healthy options may also be used to bring in less healthy options | Efforts to attract healthy food retail may inadvertently allow or incentivize less healthy options. For example, retailers in underserved communities may be accustomed to selling low-cost and less healthy food options, and may use any incentives to continue selling these items, instead of healthier options. | • Consider linking specific requirements for healthy food to any incentives to attract or enhance food retail, particularly in underserved communities.  
• Provide support to food retail outlets operating in food deserts that meet some established healthy food requirements (e.g., additional vending permits, training, Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) equipment). |

Build the Team: Partnership for Success

Successful efforts to implement land use planning strategies to increase access to healthy food depend on bringing a diverse set of partners to the table early, consistently, and authentically. These partners may include the following:

- Community development, revitalization, and redevelopment agencies and organizations
- Community members (of diverse abilities, ages, cultures, gender, income levels, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation)
- Developers
- Food system coalitions and organizations
- Leaders and community champions from multiple sectors
- Local economic development agency
- Local farmers and regional food distributors
- Public health agencies
- Organizations serving populations experiencing health inequities
- Public Works Department
- Retailers and vendors
- Social service agencies
- Zoning and Planning organizations
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Using Planning and Zoning to Create Access to Healthy and Affordable Foods

**Buffalo, NY**

An unstable economy has left the once-thriving city of Buffalo with a declining population, unemployment, high rates of poverty, and chronic disease. It has also left a large number of vacant lots. While some may view vacant lots as blight, residents saw an opportunity to turn them into community gardens. However, the current comprehensive plan and zoning code was difficult for residents to navigate.

A team led by Dr. Samina Raja, Associate Professor at the University of Buffalo, works with the Massachusetts Avenue Project (MAP), a community-based organization, to tackle one of Buffalo’s biggest challenges - food insecurity. In 2008, the University team mapped grocery stores and found there were fewer grocery stores in communities of color than predominately white communities. MAP took on this challenge by bringing a mobile market to neighborhoods without a grocery store to increase residents’ access to healthy and affordable foods; but an existing zoning ordinance restricted where the vehicle could park.

Through a partnership with the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus, several organizations including the University of Buffalo, MAP, and others formed Healthy Kids, Healthy Communities (with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation)—at a time when Buffalo was focusing its efforts on policy improvement strategies. Buffalo was undergoing an update of its land use plan and zoning code, and the partnership saw an opportunity to highlight the links between zoning and food access. Youth from MAP’s programs and other groups in Buffalo were invited to help educate community stakeholders on the benefits of improving access to healthy food sources. They also discussed the impact of zoning codes on growing healthy and culturally appropriate food in the community.

As a result of these educational efforts, the mayor announced his support of strategies that promote access to healthy foods at the first Buffalo Food Policy Summit. The city of Buffalo will likely implement a zoning code that supports an equitable food environment by including strategies such as making market gardens a permissible land use. In addition, the Food Policy Council of Buffalo and Erie County was created by the Erie County Board of Health, and will provide support and act as a resource on food systems and its impact on the health of the community.
Los Angeles, CA

South Los Angeles residents suffer from disproportionate rates of chronic disease and low life expectancy. In 1992, the nonprofit organization Community Health Councils (CHC) formed to address the health care safety net crisis in Los Angeles. Seven years later, health disparities loomed large in South LA, and CHC explored the root causes of these inequities. Using a model for social change grounded in community engagement and coalition building, CHC focused on inequities surrounding food and the built environment. The group took the time to build key relationships, an important step for addressing unintended consequences as they arose.

Community members, churches, and community-based organizations, in collaboration with CHC, led an intensive assessment that documented disparities in food access with support from CDC’s Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health program. Over 100 residents participated, many traveling to West LA (an area with some of the best health outcomes in the county) to note differences in the types of food available. Compared with West LA, South LA lacked sufficient grocery stores that carried healthful foods and faced an overabundance of fast food restaurants. The inequity in access to healthy foods became apparent, and community forums spurred dialogue about environmental impacts on health.

Residents envisioned what a healthy South LA would look like and determined that healthy food options were critical. With this groundwork and support from the community, CHC explored strategies to address the density of fast food restaurants and attract grocery stores. The City Council approved a Grocery Store and Sit-Down Restaurant Incentive package that created economic incentives for attracting healthy food retailers to South LA. Building upon relationships with the local planning department, CHC also worked to support the implementation of other strategies to create a healthier food environment. In 2008, the Los Angeles City Council established an interim control policy that placed a moratorium on permits for new stand-alone fast food restaurants in the targeted neighborhoods for a maximum two-year period. The moratorium later became a permanent policy in the form of a general plan amendment preventing the development of new stand-alone fast food restaurants within a half-mile of an existing establishment.

By focusing on the needs identified by community members, CHC made meaningful strides toward improving the food environment. Community members were involved in every step of the process. Lark Galloway Gilliam, Executive Director of CHC stated the key to a successful initiative: “Don’t leave the community behind. Let the community lead.”
Supportive breastfeeding strategies to improve the initiation, exclusivity, and duration of breastfeeding may include addressing hospital practices (e.g., Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative), supporting workplace accommodations, and building supportive community environments.

Make the Case:
Why is this a health equity issue?

The issues below highlight the need for breastfeeding strategies that advance health equity:

- **Inadequate Access to Services and Support for Some Populations Experiencing Inequities**: Breastfeeding rates are lowest among African American mothers and mothers living in rural areas. Several factors may account for lower rates of breastfeeding among African American mothers, including how they are treated by healthcare providers with respect to breastfeeding encouragement and information. For mothers in rural areas, factors such as poverty and inadequate access to needed maternity and health services may serve as barriers to breastfeeding.

- **Limited Access to Breastfeeding Support in the Workplace**: Mothers returning to the workplace may face several barriers to breastfeeding due to workplace conditions (e.g., break time for pumping, onsite storage) and the level of benefits provided (e.g., maternity leave). For instance, many mothers do not have paid maternity leave. Additionally, those with lower incomes and those in the service and manufacturing fields have been found to have even lower rates of paid maternity/family leave. Breastfeeding may also be particularly challenging for hourly, low-wage mothers as they may have less flexibility and break options.

- **Social Norms May Serve as a Barrier for Underserved Communities**: Social norms such as lack of support from family and friends and not having examples of breastfeeding may be barriers for some population groups. Additional barriers may include norms around the sexual role of breasts as opposed to their nurturing function of breastfeeding, and perceptions of breastfeeding as an unusual feeding option.
# Design and Implement with Health Equity in Mind

To maximize health impact and advance health equity, consider these factors and others when designing, implementing, and evaluating breastfeeding strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>BARRIERS OR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIMITED RESOURCES &amp; CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td>The process required for achieving official Baby-Friendly Hospital designation may seem too rigorous for some facilities or present barriers within overburdened hospitals.</td>
<td>• Provide additional support to hospitals serving populations with disparities in breastfeeding to help them work toward Baby-Friendly Hospital designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIABILITY IN CARE PROVIDED</strong></td>
<td>Varying cultural and socioeconomic factors, as well as a lack of information on breastfeeding, may result in some women not receiving the support they need to initiate and continue breastfeeding.</td>
<td>• Train providers on breastfeeding disparities and approaches to address cultural and economic barriers to ensure they provide appropriate breastfeeding education to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>Mothers may get discouraged from breastfeeding when they face challenges and do not have support from properly trained individuals.</td>
<td>• Encourage use of properly trained peer counselors, along with professional support, to provide culturally tailored support for breastfeeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIABILITY IN ADOPTION &amp; IMPLEMENTATION OF BREASTFEEDING STRATEGIES</strong></td>
<td>Some employers, including those that employ low-wage staff, may not understand how to properly accommodate breastfeeding workers. They may also lack the resources and infrastructure (e.g., space, refrigeration) to comply with breastfeeding regulations.</td>
<td>• Partner with WIC and other organizations to identify residents who reflect the cultural values of breastfeeding mothers and can be trained as peer counselors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Build the Team: Partnership for Success

Successful efforts to implement supportive breastfeeding strategies depend on bringing a diverse set of partners to the table early, consistently, and authentically. These partners may include the following:

- Chambers of commerce
- Childcare centers and provider organizations (e.g., Head Start)
- Community-based organizations
- Community members (of diverse abilities, ages, cultures, gender, income levels, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation)
- Cultural institutions and networks
- Faith-based organizations
- Family members
- Health care systems, hospitals, community clinics, and health care providers
- Local businesses
- Local/regional employers (particularly employers of low-income, hourly workers)
- Public health agencies
- Regional and local breastfeeding coalitions (e.g., La Leche League, lactation consultants)
- Social service agencies
- State and local WIC programs

HEALTH EQUITY IN ACTION

Promoting Baby-Friendly Hospitals to Increase Equity

Los Angeles, CA

Of the 50 California counties where births occur, Los Angeles County ranked 43rd out of 50 for exclusive breastfeeding rates. Furthermore, Los Angeles County housed 9 of the 15 lowest scoring hospitals in the state.168 In response, Breastfeed LA: Breastfeeding Task Force of Greater Los Angeles collaborated with the Regional Perinatal Programs of California to provide training and technical assistance to improve the quality of maternal care and guide hospitals toward the Baby-Friendly Hospital designation.

In 2008 and 2009, Breastfeed LA reached out to hospital decision makers, emphasizing breastfeeding as a quality improvement indicator and promoting baby-friendly practices. Focusing on three counties with the lowest rates of exclusive breastfeeding, the group provided bedside nurse and train-the-trainer workshops using the Birth and Beyond California169 curriculum. Priority was given to hospitals with high birth rates, high rates of Medi-Cal (state Medicaid) use, and low breastfeeding rates. The funding for this project was from the California Department of Public Health Federal Title V Maternal and Child Health Block Grant.

Hospital participation in some areas was sluggish at first. To overcome lack of interest, Breastfeed LA, with funding from First 5 LA, encouraged local public health officials to become champions by making the case to hospitals that breastfeeding is a public health issue. Grants were given to targeted hospitals from the First 5 LA Baby-Friendly Hospital Project, which helped these hospitals overcome the cost barrier for staff training and systems improvements. These hospitals primarily serve women of color and low-income women.

Collaborative learning has been a key strategy. Breastfeed LA and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health are convening three Regional Hospital Breastfeeding Consortia where lower performing hospitals can learn from higher performing ones. Since the Consortia kickoff in April 2010, 11 LA hospitals have achieved Baby-Friendly Hospital designation. Many more are in the process.

Note: Breastfeed LA is a partner with the County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Health to continue the vital work of encouraging and guiding hospitals to improve maternity care practices and ultimately achieve Baby-Friendly designation. With support from CDC’s Communities Putting Prevention to Work program, the three County Hospitals achieved the Baby-Friendly Designation, and technical assistance is being provided to 16 additional hospitals with support from CDC’s Community Transformation Grants program.
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Building Community Capacity to Support Breastfeeding

New York, NY

Breastfeeding initiation rates in central Brooklyn hospitals were high\(^{170}\) but women may have found breastfeeding challenging to maintain and integrate into their daily routines.\(^{171}\) With funding from the Health Resources and Services Administration, Healthy Start Brooklyn (HSB) found innovative ways to support these women. Coordinated efforts that focused on five low-income, predominantly African American and Latino neighborhoods created empowerment zones to shift breastfeeding practices and norms. The By My Side program was developed to deliver low-cost services to low-income and immigrant women. It also opened up job opportunities for women living in the targeted neighborhoods. Women were trained as doulas, providing emotional, physical, and informational support to mothers during delivery and conducting home visits before and after birth. Doula services that are typically available to higher-wealth communities are now accessible by low-income families through By My Side. The doulas also serve as lactation consultants, offering guidance on how to breastfeed and linking mothers to resources such as HSB’s Breastfeeding 911! Hotline.

Program results show that mothers who have used a doula have higher rates of exclusive breastfeeding. In addition to integrating doula services into hospital practices, HSB has reached out to organizations with strong community ties to initiate culturally appropriate breastfeeding support, expanding the training program so organizations can offer their own doula services. By March 2012, the program had successfully trained more than 30 women in the community. These doulas, along with those already working for By My Side, have participated in more than 100 births.

HSB supports the continuation of breastfeeding behaviors beyond hospital doors by shifting community norms, creating new long-term economic opportunities, and improving the lives of women and their families overall. Some 125 faith-based institutions now have breastfeeding spaces and signs on their premises. Working with pharmacies to provide a space for breastfeeding in their stores is a next step.
APPENDIX A
Health Disparities in Chronic Disease Risk Factors by Population Group

APPENDIX B
Considerations for Health Equity-Oriented Strategy Selection, Design, and Implementation

APPENDIX C
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Despite decades of effort to reduce and eliminate health disparities, they have largely persisted—and in some cases are widening.\textsuperscript{9-11} Specifically related to chronic diseases, there is a concentrated, disproportionate burden of chronic disease in many underserved populations and communities. The table below describes disparities in chronic disease risk factors by various population groups.

### Health Disparities in Chronic Disease Risk Factors by Population Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of Color (Racial/Ethnic Minorities)</td>
<td>According to the 2010 Census, approximately 16% of Americans identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino, 13% as Black, 5% as Asian, 1% as American Indian and Alaska Native, and 0.2% as Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander.\textsuperscript{231} On a variety of health indicators, significant disparities among these racial and ethnic minorities continue to exist.\textsuperscript{7,232} For example, adult obesity rates in the U.S. are higher among non-Hispanic African Americans (50%) and Mexican Americans (40%) than among non-Hispanic Whites (35%), and they are highest among African American women, at 59%.\textsuperscript{233} In 2011, cigarette smoking among adults was highest among American Indian/Alaska Native populations (32%), compared to other racial/ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{234}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Mental or Substance Use Disorders</td>
<td>In the United States, adults with mental or substance use disorders comprise approximately 25% of the population. However, this population accounts for an estimated 40% of all cigarettes smoked resulting in a disproportionate burden from the health consequences of smoking.\textsuperscript{235}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Living in Rural Communities</td>
<td>Approximately 19%, or 60 million Americans, live in rural areas.\textsuperscript{236} Rural residents are more likely to be elderly, in poverty, in fair or poor health, and to have chronic health conditions.\textsuperscript{48} For example, the prevalence of obesity is higher in rural adults (40%) than urban adults (33%).\textsuperscript{237} Adults living in non-metropolitan counties also have a higher average annual percentage of smoking (27%) than adults living in large metropolitan counties (18%).\textsuperscript{238}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Approximately 20% of U.S. adults have a disability.\textsuperscript{239} Approximately 28% of adults with disabilities smoke, compared to 16% of those without a disability.\textsuperscript{31} Adults with disabilities are more likely to be physically inactive (22%) than are adults without disabilities (10%).\textsuperscript{240} Obesity is also higher among adults with a disability (38%) compared to those without a disability (24%), according to self-reported data.\textsuperscript{241}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2011, an estimated 15% of the U.S. population lived below the federal poverty level. Poverty is correlated with perceived and actual poor health outcomes. People living in poverty are five times more likely to report their health as “poor” compared to high-income individuals. People with a household income below the poverty line (29%) have a much higher prevalence of smoking compared to people with household incomes at or above the poverty line (18%). Healthy eating (specifically fruit and vegetable consumption) is also lower among low-income populations compared to higher income populations.

Approximately 15% of Americans 25 years old and older have not earned a high school diploma. Those with undergraduate degrees have a lower prevalence of smoking (9%), compared to those with less than a high school education (25%) or only a high school diploma (24%). Additionally, those with a GED have the highest prevalence of smoking (45%). Regarding obesity, college graduates or above had the lowest rate of obesity (28%) in 2009-2010, compared to those with less than a high school education (38%).

The proportion of our nation’s population aged 65 years and older is expected to increase from approximately 13% of the population in 2010 to an estimated 19% in 2030. In 2009–2010, 45% of adults aged 65 and over were diagnosed with two or more chronic conditions. Regarding inequities, older adults living in poverty and isolation may be particularly vulnerable.

The lesbian, gay, or bisexual population is estimated at 3.5% in the United States, with an additional 0.3% identifying as transgender. Regarding sexual orientation, use of any tobacco products have been found to be higher among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender populations (38.5%) compared to the heterosexual/straight population (25.3%). Obesity prevalence has also been noted among the LGBT community, particularly among lesbians who have been shown to have a higher prevalence of being overweight and obese than heterosexual women who are overweight and obese.

NOTE: This list is not exhaustive and the groups are not mutually exclusive; individuals may belong to more than one population group.
Policy, systems, and environmental improvement strategies have great potential to prevent and reduce health inequities, affect a large portion of a population, and can also be leveraged to address the underlying social determinants of health. However, without careful design and implementation, such interventions may inadvertently widen health inequities. Collaborate with partners and community members, including those experiencing health inequities, to identify possible barriers or negative unintended consequences that may limit a strategy’s effectiveness. Then, account for identified challenges in strategy development to maximize the health effects for all and reduce health inequities. Consider the following barriers, unintended consequences, and questions when selecting, designing, and implementing equity-oriented strategies:

1. **LIMITED COMMUNITY CAPACITY AND RESOURCES**

Variability in community capacity and resources can influence decisions about which communities and community organizations to partner with, especially if resources are limited. While there are benefits to funding and collaborating with partners that can “hit the ground running,” it is also important to build the capacity of other groups through training and additional support.

- Has lack of capacity or resources kept critical partners away?
- What training opportunities can build the capacity of residents or organizations to make community improvements?
- Are the same organizations repeatedly benefiting from funds distributed in the community? What steps can you take to engage other organizations?

2. **VARIABILITY IN HEALTH LITERACY**

Addressing health literacy means ensuring that all members of the community have the capacity to access and understand the information they need to engage in health improvement strategies or reap their health benefits.

- Will the improvements be understood by all community members?
- Is training needed to support and sustain the improvements?
- How will language, culture, and other differences be accommodated?

3. **LACK OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT, AWARENESS, AND PARTICIPATION**

A well-designed effort may fail to reach its full potential if residents are unaware of the improvements or were not invited to participate in the planning and implementation process. Community residents and stakeholders should be consulted and engaged from the very start, and this engagement should be sustained throughout the process.

- How will stakeholders representative of the community’s diversity be engaged?
- What steps will be taken to engage community members in planning, implementation, and evaluation?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>COST, RESOURCES, AND OTHER FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There may be costs related to strategy implementation, either for the institutions making the improvements, or for the people who are the intended beneficiaries of these improvements. Examine how budget constraints may hinder implementation or uptake in underserved communities.</td>
<td>• Will costs prevent underserved populations from fully benefitting from the strategy? How can affordability be ensured for all? • Which partners might be able to help provide required resources (e.g., funding, materials, staff, other assets) to implement the strategy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personal transportation, unaffordable or unreliable public transportation, or inadequate infrastructure may reduce access to goods, services, or environmental improvements, including tobacco cessation services and other health care services. Explore whether transportation issues such as access, cost, and proximity exist.</td>
<td>• Is lack of transportation a problem for the intended beneficiaries of the strategy? • Are the locations where services are provided too distant, inconvenient, inaccessible, or unsafe?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>POTENTIAL DISPLACEMENT EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing community conditions may contribute to cycles of displacement. It is important to ensure that improvements will benefit residents rather than create conditions that displace them. Identify factors that may drive displacement and protections that can prevent it.</td>
<td>• How might community improvement strategies lead to displacement in the future? • What protections can be put in place to preserve affordable housing and prevent displacement? • How might concerns about displacement prevent residents from engaging in community improvements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>VARIABILITY IN IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneven implementation of a policy or systems improvement may worsen inequities. Explore the factors (including those listed in this table) that might prevent consistent implementation of a strategy and develop solutions early in the planning process.</td>
<td>• Once your strategy is adopted or implemented, what steps will ensure proper implementation? • How will you ensure implementation occurs where it’s needed most? • Which institutions need additional support to implement the improvements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>CRIME/SAFETY INFLUENCES (BOTH REAL AND PERCEIVED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even if effective strategies are put in place, fear of crime at locations where the intervention or service is being delivered may keep residents from using the new resources. Assess safety conditions and residents’ perceptions of these conditions, and, if necessary, take steps to ensure participants’ safety.</td>
<td>• How might concerns about safety prevent the community from benefitting from the strategy? • Are there visible signs of crime and violence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>LACK OF AWARENESS OF DIVERSE NORMS AND CUSTOMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the diversity in culture, norms, and customs among population groups can ensure that strategies are designed to be inclusive. Institutions also have their own customs and norms, and these should also be considered, as they might affect decision making.</td>
<td>• How will community members with different norms and customs be engaged in strategy design? • Are differences in culture and norms understood in ways that result in respectful strategy development?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table describes several online resources that you may be able to use to identify and understand health inequities in your area. This list is not exhaustive and you should determine what best fits your local needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIORAL RISK FACTOR SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (BRFSS)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;251&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A state-based system of health surveys that collects information on health risk behaviors, preventive health practices, and health care access primarily related to chronic disease and injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENSUS DATA</strong>&lt;sup&gt;252&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A database that provides demographic information on income, education, race/ethnicity, housing, and other factors that are viewable at multiple levels: national, state, county, and smaller geographic areas. Interactive features also allow cross tabulation of indicators and population groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY COMMONS</strong>&lt;sup&gt;253&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>An online interactive mapping tool that provides free geographic information systems (GIS) data from the state level to the block group level. The Commons is linked to the National Prevention Strategy and provides a peer learning network and other resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY HEALTH ASSESSMENT &amp; GROUP EVALUATION (CHANGE): BUILDING A FOUNDATION OF KNOWLEDGE TO PRIORITIZE COMMUNITY NEEDS</strong>&lt;sup&gt;257&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A tool to help community teams develop a community action plan. This tool provides steps for community team members to use in an assessment process. It also helps define and prioritize possible areas of improvement to address the root causes of chronic diseases, as well as related risk factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY HEALTH RANKINGS: MOBILIZING ACTION TOWARD COMMUNITY HEALTH</strong>&lt;sup&gt;254&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A ranking of counties in each of the 50 states according to summaries of a variety of health measures. Summary measures include health outcomes (mortality and morbidity) and health factors (health behaviors, clinical care, social and economic aspects, and physical environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS (CHSI)</strong></td>
<td>A report that contains over 200 measures for each of the 3,141 U.S. counties. The report presents indicators for deaths due to heart disease and cancer as well as on behavioral factors such as tobacco use, diet, physical activity, alcohol and drug use, sexual behavior, and others that substantially contribute to these deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA SET DIRECTORY OF SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH AT THE LOCAL LEVEL</strong></td>
<td>A directory that contains an extensive list of existing data sets that can be used to address social determinants of health. The data sets are organized according to 12 dimensions (broad categories) of the social environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTHY COMMUNITIES NETWORK (HCN)</strong></td>
<td>A network that tracks over 200 health and quality-of-life indicators. It also provides guidance on 1,800-plus community-level interventions. Local information is collected and combined with other data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH DISPARITIES CALCULATOR</strong></td>
<td>Statistical software from the National Cancer Institute that imports population-based health data and calculates different disparity measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH EQUITY INDEX</strong></td>
<td>An online tool created by the Connecticut Association of Directors of Health that outlines and measures the social determinants of health with specific health outcomes. The index produces scores as well as GIS maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH INDICATORS WAREHOUSE</strong></td>
<td>A Web site maintained by CDC’s National Center for Health Statistics. This resource provides data on communities’ health status as well as different determinants. There are over 1,000 indicators that can be categorized by geography, initiative, or topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE TOOL FOR HEALTH AND RESILIENCE IN VULNERABLE ENVIRONMENTS (THRIVE)</strong></td>
<td>A tool intended to help people understand and prioritize the factors within their own communities in order to improve health and safety. The tool identifies key factors around equitable opportunity, people, and place, and allows users to rate how important each factor might be in their community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEALTH EQUITY CHECKLIST: CONSIDERING HEALTH EQUITY IN THE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The Health Equity Checklist provides questions for consideration when designing a strategy to ensure health equity remains central to all aspects of an initiative.

STEP 1: IDENTIFY

Clearly identify health inequities and protective factors in both health outcomes and community conditions across population groups and geographic areas through the use of existing data, community input, and environmental assessments.

STEP 2: ENGAGE

Include and meaningfully engage representatives of population(s)/area(s) defined in Step 1 in your partnerships, coalitions, or on leadership teams.

STEP 3: ANALYZE

Ensure the selection, design, and implementation of strategies are linked to the inequities identified in Step 1, and will work to advance health equity. Consider the following:

- Is the strategy TARGETED to a population group(s)/area(s) experiencing health inequities?
  - Is the outcome written in a way that allows you to measure the effect of efforts?
  - Is it culturally tailored to the unique needs of population group(s)/area(s) experiencing health inequities, and are potential barriers addressed?

- Does the strategy rely on SITE SELECTION (e.g., selecting X number of sites for smoke-free cessation services, creating X number of farmers’ markets)?
  - Do selection criteria for sites reflect populations/areas with the highest burden?
  - If not, are selection criteria logical and justified?
  - Are there additional supports provided for selected sites that might require them to be successful?

- Is the strategy POPULATION-WIDE?
  - Have population(s)/area(s) experiencing health inequities been engaged in efforts to identify possible barriers and unintended consequences of the proposed strategy?
  - Are identified barriers regarding implementation and enforcement being addressed?
  - Have potential unintended consequences been considered and accounted for in proposed activities?

STEP 4: REVIEW

Review evaluation and monitoring plans to ensure health equity-related efforts will be measured. Additionally, ensure appropriate data will be collected to conduct sub-analyses. These data will help in assessing the differential effects of each strategy across population group(s)/area(s), as well as the overall impact of strategies on reducing health inequities.
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