A Critical Path:

Taking Steps Towards a More Effective Pedestrian Advocacy Organization

Jeff Barber, MPA candidate
School of Public Administration
University of Victoria
July 2016

Client: Sally Reid and Arielle Guetta, Steering Committee Co-Chairs
Walk On, Victoria

Supervisor: Dr. Bart Cunningham, Professor
School of Public Administration, University of Victoria

Second Reader: Dr. Kim Speers, Professor
School of Public Administration, University of Victoria

Chair: Dr. Herman Bakvis, Professor
School of Public Administration, University of Victoria

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have so many people to thank for helping me complete this project and degree. It was a long and sometimes bumpy road, and I couldn't have done it without help.

First, I would like to thank the people who volunteered to participate in the interviews for this project. I greatly appreciate you taking time out of your busy schedules, and your thoughtful, insightful and candid responses. Your input was extremely valuable and revealed some important and interesting trends. I hope you are able to draw on this report and apply some of the lessons learned to your own organizations.

To my parents, thank you for the constant emotional support and editing help as well. I love you both.

To my supervisor, Dr. Bart Cunningham, thank you for your direction and advice.

To my clients and friends, Sally and Arielle, I am eternally grateful for this research opportunity. Your accomplishments with Walk On, Victoria are impressive and inspirational, and it is an honour to be able to contribute to this group.

To everyone from my MPA cohort, I can't thank you enough for your unwavering support and friendship. I feel so lucky to have gotten to known all of you over the last few years. I've never met such a smart, funny, and caring group of people. I knew I could always count on you for a piece of advice, a beer, and a laugh. I look forward to many more games nights and ridiculous quotes.

Finally, I would like to thank fellow members of the "Final Four": Justine, Robin and Cailin, who all completed their projects concurrently to mine. I couldn't have gotten through this project without you guys. Throughout the process, I leaned heavily on your constant encouragement and advice. We did it!

It's over. Let's party.

Barber out.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The pedestrian advocacy movement that has emerged over the last few years has aimed to put walkability and pedestrians' interests at the forefront of urban planning discussions. Pedestrian advocacy organizations work with government officials, developers, community organizations and citizens to create more walkable communities. In Victoria, BC, a new pedestrian advocacy organization – Walk On, Victoria – has been active in providing a voice for pedestrians in the city. The organization has successfully advocated for a number of changes, such as additional funding for crosswalk improvements, and is developing a strong following of supporters.

While they have experienced early success, the leadership of Walk On, Victoria wants to find out how the organization can further increase its legitimacy, influence, impact in the community, and long-term stability. The purpose of this research project is to recommend actions for the group to accomplish these goals.

Methodology and Conceptual Framework

A two-part qualitative methodological approach was used for this research. First, relevant literature was reviewed, and second, semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives from ten different North American pedestrian advocacy organizations. The literature review examined general literature on advocacy organizations and non-profit effectiveness, as well as studies on pedestrian advocacy specifically. The most common themes in the literature related to advocacy organizational effectiveness were used to build a conceptual framework. The themes that were identified are as follows:

- Governance and Structure
- Resources and Capacity
- Membership Engagement
- Projects and Initiatives
- Public Reach
- Relationships With Policymakers and Other Organizations

This framework, in conjunction with consultation sessions held with the client, was used to develop interview questions to identify specific actions that the participating pedestrian advocacy organizations have taken in each theme area, and how these actions have affected the effectiveness of the organization. The interview findings, with support from the literature, were then used to formulate recommended actions for the client.

Key Findings

Governance and Structure. Respondents were asked about their organizations' leadership model, decision-making processes, succession planning, and accountability measures. Most respondent groups are run by a board of directors and/or steering committee,

while some divide their work into different subcommittees. Most reported that they arrive at decisions through consensus of the leadership group. Many organizations periodically engage in some form of strategic planning to ensure their activities are supporting its overall goals, mission and vision. While the majority of respondents reported their organizations had done little or no succession planning, some groups have formalized processes for recruiting new steering committee members and rotating leadership responsibilities among their current members. Some groups highlighted the importance of empowering staff and volunteers to make decisions as much as possible in order to build leadership capacity within the organization. To ensure organizational accountability, respondents emphasized regular communication to members and the public, and reporting out on activities, finances and performance of the organization in relation to its stated mission and goals.

Resources and Capacity. Respondents identified grants, donations, fees for service, sponsorships and membership fees as sources of revenue. Many participants indicated a desire to diversify their funding sources to not rely so heavily on grants, which can be difficult to acquire and are often unreliable. Some organizations choose to retain a volunteer model so that they can focus on advocacy and not have to worry about fundraising. To manage capacity issues, respondents reported using a variety of strategies. These included strategic project selection, volunteer programs, partnerships with other advocacy groups or community organizations, advocacy training, developing in-house expertise, focusing on policy advocacy over programs delivery, and expanding the size of the steering committee.

Membership Engagement. Social media, email lists, and face-to-face interaction at public events were the most-cited modes of membership engagement. Some organizations also use advocacy efforts, such as letter-writing campaigns and walk audits, to engage with members. Respondents placed a strong emphasis on ensuring various demographic segments of the community have representation within their organizations. They noted the importance of having a diversity of ages, neighbourhoods, races and ethnicities, income levels, as well as representation from key groups, such as people with physical impairments and parents of young children.

Projects and Initiatives. Organizations generally partake in four main categories of projects and initiatives: advocacy, events, education and empowerment, and programs and services. Advocacy efforts include providing input and consultation on walkability-related policies and projects, publicly advocating for or against various policies, and lobbying for more infrastructure funding from government. Examples of events include promotional events, theme walks, and public lectures on walkability and pedestrian issues. Education initiatives reported by respondents include providing information and resources on the organization's website and providing advocacy training through neighbourhood walking ambassadors and advocacy toolkits. Programs and services include providing contracted technical services, such as walk audits and health impact assessments, and delivering local programming to support national or international campaigns such as Vision Zero.

Public Reach. Respondents reported two contrasting approaches to membership growth. Some make intentional, concerted efforts to grow their membership base, citing the increased legitimacy of a larger organization and the greater potential for donations or membership fees. The majority of respondents, however, said that their membership growth is organic in nature, and that they stay focused on advocacy and program delivery. Some cautioned that rapid membership growth can create additional capacity issues, and that outreach can be expensive. They said that gaining the support of key members of the community is more important the number of people on the group's mailing list. To inspire citizens to effect change and ensure the organization's message resonates with the public, respondents said it is important to use not only data and evidence to support advocacy, but also storytelling and personal experiences. Several organizations discussed the challenge of establishing a "pedestrian identity," since many people do not self-identify as walkers. Organizations highlight a variety of walkability factors in order to inspire people, including safety, social justice, economics, building attractive public spaces, and health benefits.

Relationships With Policymakers and Other Organizations. Respondents said that they regularly work with local governments in a collaborative fashion, and that it is important to maintain a respectful working relationship with officials in order to make progress. Local governments often have similar goals to pedestrian advocacy organizations with respect to walkability, so respondents said it is important to find common ground. Praising good decisions, demonstrating the value of the organization, and inviting officials to group meetings and events were identified as relationship-building strategies. Many organizations also said they occasionally use dissenting approaches to publicly pressure governments. Examples include protests, letter-writing campaigns and legal action. When taking this approach, respondents stressed it is important to be respectful to preserve the long-term working relationship. Respondents also placed a high emphasis on building strong coalitions with other advocacy organizations, businesses, and community groups. This can increase the legitimacy of the group, create pressure on politicians to enact change, and allow the group to access and leverage other organizations' resources and expertise. Respondents reported good relationships with cycling advocacy groups overall, but many said there were some points of contention. They emphasized the importance of maintaining separate groups, resolving issues behind the scenes, and maintaining a strong public alliance for better active transportation infrastructure and policies.

Recommendations

Recommended actions for the client are summarized in the following table:

Theme Area	Recommendations
Governance and Structure	Divide the work of the steering committee into theme areas.
	Regularly engage in strategic planning.
	Formalize process for renewing the leadership of the group.
	Retain unincorporated volunteer organization model.
Resources and Capacity	Expand the size of the steering committee to increase capacity.
	Collaborate with post-secondary students on research opportunities.
	Create a criteria sheet for selecting projects to ensure they have a significant impact, and align with mission, vision and available resources.
	Develop steering committee members' skills through courses and workshops.
Membership Engagement	Expand and formalize social media presence.
	Host theme walks and incorporate advocacy efforts/data collection.
	Solicit volunteers to become neighbourhood walking ambassadors or help organize and run events.
	Improve representation of geographic areas and key demographics of the community within the organization.
Projects and Initiatives	Focus on primarily on advocacy, with a secondary focus on events to maintain a visible presence.
	Provide advocacy training and resources to members through an advocacy tool kit, walk audits, and providing resources on the website.
	Undertake only a few initiatives at a time, and establish some "quick wins" to demonstrate value to policymakers and the community.
Public Reach	Focus on reaching out to influential figures and organizations in the community.
	Target specific segments of the population that take a strong interest in walkability and tailor messaging towards the issues that affect them the most.
Relationships With Policymakers and Other Organizations	Maintain a positive working relationship with local government.
	Build coalitions with other non-profit community organizations.
	Build coalitions with business organizations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

"All truly great thoughts are conceived by walking"

- **Friedrich Nietzsche**

"Social entrepreneurs are not content just to give a fish or teach how to fish. They will not rest until they have revolutionized the fishing industry."

- **Bill Drayton**

*"I'm learnin' to walk again,
Can't you see I've waited long enough
Where do I begin?"*

- **Dave Grohl**

INTRODUCTION

Advocacy organizations play an important role in Canadian democracy because they focus attention on many issues that are overlooked or underrepresented by traditional private and public sector organizations. These organizations can help address these deficiencies and ensure that the issues receive attention from policymakers. Sometimes, advocacy groups become large, complex and well-funded organizations. Often, however, advocacy groups are loosely organized and run by groups of ordinary citizens with a shared interest or concern. These people are often passionate about the cause, and may have many good ideas about what needs to be changed. However, as small grassroots organizations, they often lack the institutional support, community presence, and resources necessary to drive meaningful change.

An advocacy organization may have a clear vision and mission, passionate and capable volunteers, and even some financial resources available. However, it can still be an uphill battle to effect change. The group may know where it wants to go, but it may not be clear how to get there. What is the best way to advocate for change? Whose support does the group need? Should the organization work with policymakers behind the scenes, or conduct public campaigns? What specific issues should they focus on? What tools and tactics should the group use to effect change? How can the group grow and engage with its membership? How can the organization sustain itself in the long term, and ensure it is a legitimate and reliable community actor? These are just some of the questions new advocacy groups face, and because they often do not initially have access to the support, resources or networks of traditional institutions, it can be challenging to establish themselves as legitimate and influential community organizations.

Background

Walking is an important part of the fabric of the community. Nearly everybody walks at some point during their day, and studies have shown that walkable cities have healthier citizens, are safer for seniors and children, are more environmentally friendly, are more socially equitable, have more robust tourism economies, and have more attractive public spaces and vibrant communities (Boyle et al, 2014; Evenson et al, 2012; Frank et al, 2014; Hoehner et al, 2011; Li et al, 2014; Manaugh & El-Geneidy, 2013; Reis et al, 2013). Despite all of these benefits, the interests of pedestrians are sometimes forgotten in public planning processes. Creating a walkable city requires intentional efforts to ensure adequate walking space, well-marked crosswalks, reasonable traffic speeds, street connectivity, well-maintained sidewalks, and attractive streetscapes. However, government officials must consider many different social, economic and environmental factors when designing a city. Land use, parking requirements, traffic flow, business promotion, transit and cycling infrastructure, green spaces, and utility accommodation are just a few examples of issues that compete for the attention of urban planners. Many North American cities were built and planned around the automobile, often creating communities that are very unfriendly to those on foot.

A common saying among those interested in transportation policy is that while some people drive, some people cycle, and some people take transit, almost everybody walks. Walking is an important part of our daily lives, whether it is done for transportation, recreation, exercise, or other purposes. We walk to work, walk to school, walk to and from our cars, bikes or transit, walk in parks, walk to go shopping, walk to explore, walk to socialize, walk to think.

Pedestrian advocacy organizations provide a voice for pedestrians and advocate for better walking conditions in their communities. By raising issues and providing input into planning decisions and programs and policies related to walkability, they can help build more walkable communities and protect the interests of pedestrians.

History of Pedestrian Advocacy. In her essay on the history of pedestrian advocacy in the United States, Ellen Vanderslice discusses how during the rapid urbanization of the country during the 20th century, cities were planned and built primarily to accommodate the motor vehicle. This led to significant urban sprawl, and resulted in roads and highways that did not accommodate those who chose to travel by foot. Furthermore, the rights of pedestrians were dramatically reduced in the name of safety. Vanderslice also notes that the considerable financial resources of automobile companies allowed them to wield significant influence over government policies and planning processes, leading to an even more car-centric culture and urban landscape. In the 1990s, however, pro-pedestrian citizens began organizing to fight for better walking conditions (Vanderslice, 2003).

Since then, interest and support for pedestrian advocacy has grown all over the continent, with local and national pedestrian advocacy organizations being created in many cities and states throughout Canada and the United States. Many local governments now have pedestrian committees or working groups dedicated increasing walkability in their communities. Pedestrian advocacy is also done through many other advocacy organizations and community groups at the local, provincial, national and international levels. Bike/walk associations, neighbourhood associations, walking clubs, active transportation alliances, environmental groups, and health organizations all advocate for better walkability (Napier, 2003; Vanderslice, 2003). International campaigns such as Vision Zero, a Sweden-based initiative that aims to eliminate all traffic deaths, have sparked even greater interest in walkability and pedestrian advocacy (Vision Zero Initiative, 2016). Canada Walks recently launched the National Action Strategy for Walking, a broad-based initiative that will bring together organizations from all over the country to work with governments to make Canadian communities more walkable (Canada Walks, 2016).

Project Client. Walk On, Victoria (WOV) is non-profit, volunteer-run pedestrian advocacy organization that seeks to speak for the interests of pedestrians and to improve walkability in the city of Victoria. The organization is relatively new (formed in September 2014), but is quickly becoming a prominent voice in the community for pedestrian's interests. WOV's mission is "to improve the walkability of Greater Victoria's neighbourhoods and promote walking as a healthy, sustainable form of transportation and recreation."

The organization was created by two young professionals who live in Victoria, do not own vehicles, and walk most places as their primary mode of transportation. While parts of Victoria

have good walkability, they noticed that there were a number of pedestrian infrastructure issues around town that were not being addressed. For example, one of the founders noticed that an overgrown shrub near Hillside Mall was blocking the sidewalk, thus forcing pedestrians to walk on the dangerous road to go around it. Another noticed that lack of crosswalks in James Bay was making it very difficult to navigate the neighbourhood as a pedestrian. After talking with other friends and acquaintances, they realized there were numerous other issues related to walkability all over town, but no clear voice for pedestrians in the city. They wanted to see these issues and others resolved, and more broadly, to promote and advocate for walkability in Victoria on a larger scale. Thus, Walk On, Victoria was born.

Since its inception, the group's accomplishments include convincing the City of Victoria to allocate $300,000 in its budget for crosswalk upgrades, successfully advocating for pedestrian infrastructure improvements to the Douglas Street Corridor design, and organizing Walk On Week, a promotional event that received endorsement from several municipalities. The group has generated interest and support in the community, receiving some local media coverage and expanding their mailing list and social media following. They have ten members on their steering committee, hold monthly meetings, and have done some strategic planning.

Defining the Problem. Because it is a volunteer-run organization, both human and financial resources for Walk On, Victoria are scarce. The group's Steering Committee believes that further increasing the strength, reach, legitimacy and influence of the organization is critical to accomplishing its mission and vision. To do this, they want to know what actions they can take to increase their effectiveness.

Despite their early success, there are numerous constraints facing the group. The organization is not currently a registered charity or non-profit, and has very little in terms of financial resources. Various social, economic, and environmental issues in Victoria – and the many corresponding advocacy groups – create a lot of competition for the attention and resources of citizens, media, politicians and other stakeholders. In addition to these external issues, WOV is also conscious of the importance of maintaining a strong internal organization. For example, the group wants to ensure it maintains a high level of engagement with its membership, and to establish proper succession planning to ensure the long-term sustainability of the organization.

Because of these constraints, efforts by WOV to improve its effectiveness need to be focused, efficient, and evidence-based. The group wants to find out what similar organizations in other jurisdictions have done to achieve their goals. By identifying what has worked and what hasn't for these organizations, WOV hopes it can take action to become more established, effective and sustainable. Specifically, WOV wants to answer the following research question:

What actions can Walk On, Victoria take to become a more effective community advocacy organization?

To answer this question, I will seek to identify specific actions taken by pedestrian advocacy organizations and other similar advocacy groups, and examine how each action contributes to the legitimacy, stability, influence, and overall effectiveness of the organization.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

To investigate what may be required for a pedestrian advocacy organization to be effective, and to construct a framework by which the research question above can be conceptualized, I reviewed the existing literature on advocacy organizations, pedestrian advocacy efforts, and non-profit organizational effectiveness. Both academic and grey literature sources were consulted. The University of Victoria's Library Summons was the primary database used to search for literature.

Evaluating Advocacy Organization Effectiveness

It is clear from the literature review that organizational effectiveness for non-profit advocacy organizations is an under-researched topic; this has been observed by many scholars (Andrews et al, 2010; Epstein & Buhovac, 2009; Forbes, 1998; Halpin, 2014; Jun & Shiau, 2012; Prakash & Gugerty, 2010). One reason for this may be that advocacy organizational effectiveness is inherently difficult to measure. The goals of advocacy organizations are often intangible, amorphous, and tied to societal values for which there may be little or no consensus, making it difficult to objectively measure or ascertain effectiveness (Epstein & Buhovac, 2009; Forbes, 1998). Jun & Shiau (2012) note that most studies of non-profit organizational effectiveness have focused on groups that directly provide tangible goods and services, as opposed to those that provide an advocacy function. Advocacy organizations often focus on influencing public processes, such as polices and community plans, and there are no clear, unambiguous ways to measure the impact they have (Jun & Shiau, 2012).

Still, there have been some attempts to understand what drives non-profit advocacy effectiveness. Classic non-profit organization literature uses one of two basic frameworks to understand organizational effectiveness. One is the "Goal-attainment" approach, which assesses an organization's effectiveness based on how well it achieves its goals; this approach assumes the organization's goals are clearly identifiable, and that determining whether they have been achieved is an unambiguous process. The other is the "System resource" approach, which defines effectiveness in terms of how viable the organization in terms of its resource acquisition, viability and survival (Forbes, 1998; Andrews et al, 2010).

Most researchers agree that these classic approaches cannot adequately assess the effectiveness of the often complex and intangible work of advocacy organizations. Therefore, modern multidimensional approaches are favoured by researchers in this field (Andrews et al, 2010, Epstein & Buhovac, 2009; Jun & Shiau, 2012; Young & Everitt, 2004). For example, Jun & Shiau (2012) proposes a "multiple constituency" approach to understanding civic associations' effectiveness. This approach acknowledges that because of the uncertainty inherent in assessing these groups' effectiveness, aggregating the subjective judgements of how the group is performing by different stakeholder groups is the best way to determine overall effectiveness.

Because different stakeholders have different and even divergent perspectives in evaluation processes, assessment of effectiveness may vary by stakeholder; a complete picture of effectiveness must consider all stakeholder perspectives (Jun & Shiau, 2012).

Studies of Pedestrian Advocacy

The literature specific to pedestrian advocacy effectiveness is quite limited. The few studies that have been undertaken focus mainly on outcomes and external activities of the organizations under examination. For example, Bergman et al (2002) conducted an experiment in which the authors conducted a campaign encouraging local authorities to apply for state funding for pedestrian infrastructure improvements. This was done by "organizing local pedestrian safety task forces, compiling local injury statistics, and publicizing stories of pedestrian injury victims" (p. 264). The campaign was highly effective, as all 10 authorities that were lobbied applied for, and received, funding from their state governments (Bergman et al, 2002).

Lyons et al (2013) focused on the effects of targeted advocacy towards local politicians. In this experiment, researchers developed an advocacy package that included location-specific pedestrian safety information, and featured a range of data including pedestrian injury rates, maps of problem locations, monetary value of injury prevention, evidence-based interventions, role of government in implementing intervention, and who to contact to facilitate action. Advocacy efforts were targeted towards politicians representing areas with high rates of pedestrian injury. The advocacy package suggested a variety of outcome measures, including kilometers of roads that are traffic calmed, percentage of schools with lower speed limits, percentage of schools providing pedestrian training, percentage of politicians who lobbied for safety measures, and percentage of schools with pedestrian safety plans (Lyons et al, 2013). The experiment reported inconclusive results, as the interest level in pedestrian safety among targeted politicians rose, but the actual implementation of intervention measures remained the same. However, the authors noted that the time frame of the experiment was relatively short (30 days), and that longer term, sustained advocacy may be needed to see a difference in interventions (Lyons et al, 2013).

Richards et al (2011) also examined the effects of targeted advocacy through the development of an information sheet and toolkit. An information sheet was developed specifically for the health sector, encouraging practitioners to advocate for active transportation funding using evidence-based arguments provided in the toolkit. The study found that the toolkit was highly effective in getting the health sector to use evidence-based submissions, highlighting the importance of advocates developing partnerships with the health community and using evidence to support advocacy work (Richards et al, 2011).

Mayberry et al (2010) examined inner-city programs that advocate for pedestrian injury prevention. The authors found that people in lower-income neighbourhoods, as well as racial minorities, suffer significantly higher rates of injury in pedestrian crashes than the rest of the population. The paper argues that injury prevention advocacy programs can be an effective tool in addressing this social justice issue (Mayberry et al, 2010).

Elements of Advocacy Effectiveness – A Conceptual Framework

The limited literature on the specific topic of pedestrian advocacy effectiveness suggests that using hard evidence and building partnerships in the community are two key factors for effective advocacy. However, by reviewing the more general literature on non-profit organizational effectiveness, we can identify more key elements, and get a more complete picture of what makes an advocacy organization successful.

This is not an easy task. From the observations of researchers on the subject, we can reasonably conclude that understanding the effectiveness of pedestrian advocacy organizations is certainly not straightforward, and that identifying generalizable "truths" as to what makes an advocacy organization effective can be very difficult. Indeed, in their study of how walkable communities impact public health in Brazil, Reis et al (2013) noted that while the theory behind walkable communities is well-established in academia, there is a "clear gap between research and practice. Because policy decisions are made outside of academia…it is crucial to provide relevant, region-specific evidence" (274).

Nevertheless, examining the broader literature allows the identification of some basic common themes related to the effectiveness of advocacy organizations, and the building of a conceptual framework outlining specific areas that need to be addressed. This framework, in turn, helps to formulate more specific questions that can be asked of pedestrian advocacy organizations in the primary research portion of this report to further explore common practices and identify good ideas. One can then combine the primary findings with the literature finding to recommend specific actions for Walk On, Victoria to take to become a more effective organization.

From this framework, interview questions were developed in each of the six theme areas to investigate the experiences of the participant pedestrian advocacy organizations for this project, and identify specific actions in each area.

The conceptual framework is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1 – CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Category	Theme Area	Description
Internal Elements of Effectiveness	**Governance and Structure**	How the organization conducts its business and makes decisions, how it ensures accountability and transparency, succession planning, etc.
	Resources and Capacity	How the organization acquires and manages its human and financial resources, and how it manages its workload.
	Membership Engagement	How the organization ensures its membership is engaged and participates to advance the interests of the organization.
External Elements of Effectiveness	**Projects and Initiatives**	How the organization chooses its projects, and how effective its projects and initiatives have been in achieving its mission.
	Public Reach	How the organization ensure its message is heard by and resonates with the public.
	Relationship with Policymakers and Other Organizations	How the organization deals with relevant decision-makers and other community organizations to effect change.

Internal and External Factors. Many scholars of non-profit organizational effectiveness note that to understand the full scope of what makes an organization effective, there needs to be a clear understanding of both the internal and external functions of the group (Barakso, 2005; Smith, 2000; Andrews et al, 2010). The external workings of an organization are related to what the organization does, and how it connects with the public at large: its projects and initiatives, its relationship with the community, and its role in society. Internal workings, by contrast, relate to the organization's governance and structure; how it acquires and manages resources, and how it engages with its own membership (Smith, 2000; Andrews et al, 2010; Halpin, 2014). Halpin (2014) observes that the literature has attempted to understand advocacy organizations' effectiveness by focusing on the external actions of advocacy groups, but has paid too little attention to how these groups organize themselves internally. Prakash & Gugerty (2010) also observe that the primary focus of the advocacy literature has been on campaigns, rather than the internal workings of advocacy organizations. This focus on the external is perhaps because external actions are easier to observe and measure. The authors agree,

however, that equal attention should be given to both the internal and external functions of an organization to understand its overall effectiveness (Halpin, 2014; Prakash & Gugerty, 2010).

It therefore makes sense to divide the conceptual framework for this research into two core areas: internal factors and external factors. From there, the framework will be subdivided into themes that emerged within each area. Further review of the literature revealed three important themes in each area. Internal Factors include Governance and Structure, Resources and Capacity, and Membership Engagement. External Factors include Projects and Initiatives, Public Reach, and Relationships with Policymakers and Other Organizations.

Internal – Governance and Structure. The first major internal theme is related to how advocacy organizations structure themselves, and the rules and customs they follow in their decision-making processes. How the organization chooses and develops its leadership, makes decisions, and ensures accountability all have a major impact on its ultimate effectiveness (Andrews et al, 2010; Reid, 2007; Smith, 2000; Young & Everitt, 2004).

Organizational leadership is an important component of an organization's governance. Leadership of a voluntary, non-profit organization requires a different skill-set from traditional organizations. With volunteers, the traditional coercive tools found in employee-employer relationships are not available; leaders of volunteer organizations must find creative ways to lead, motivate, inspire, and direct volunteers (Andrews et al, 2010; Reid, 2007). Daly (2011) adds that leadership within organizations is not necessarily found just at the top; it can emerge at all levels within an organization (Daly, 2011).

Another key component of governance is an organization's level of accountability and transparency. For a non-profit organization to achieve its mission and goals, the leadership must be accountable to its membership or constituency (Epstein & Buhovac, 2009; Young & Everitt; 2004). This may be accomplished by holding annual meetings, holding elections for executives, regularly communicating activities to the membership, developing specific goals and strategies for the organization, and measuring progress by developing performance measures (Epstein & Buhovac, 2009; Young & Everitt; 2004).

The size and form of an organization also influence effectiveness. Several authors have noted that as non-profit organization grows and becomes more bureaucratic, it may become more entrenched in its mission, form and processes. While a larger organization can potentially lead to efficiency gains and greater impact, it can also make the organization less nimble and able to adapt to changing environments (Child & Gronbjerg, 2007; Halpin, 2014; McConnell, 2004). Advocacy organizations need to evaluate such trade-offs when planning future activities and growth.

Internal – Resources and Capacity. The second theme of internal organizational effectiveness identified in the literature relates to resources and capacity. There is general agreement that the extent to which an organization can acquire and manage resources has a correlation with how effective the organization will ultimately be. Prakash & Gugerty argue that non-profit advocacy organizations follow the same "supply and demand" rules as private

organizations; the difference is that they operate in "policy markets" instead of the economic goods and services normally associated with markets (Prakash & Gugerty, 2010). Therefore, they argue, advocacy groups must "follow similar logic of competition and collaboration to acquire scarce resources in order to survive."

"Resources" are not limited to financial sources. In fact, many authors argue that advocacy organizations do not need access to large amounts of financial resources to be effective; that smartly using volunteer human resources and building strategic partnerships can achieve the desired results (McConnell, 2004; Smith, 2000; Young & Everitt, 2004). Advocacy organizations often start as volunteer group with few or no financial resources, and then eventually formalize into larger organizations with more financial resources and paid staff. While more money can lead to greater influence and impact, it can also shift the focus of the organization towards resource acquisition. This can hurt public opinion if the public perceives the organization has become preoccupied with resource acquisition and has moved away from its core goals and values (McConnell, 2004).

Capacity building and capacity management is another critical piece of advocacy organizations' overall resource management regime (Andrews et al, 2010; Ruggiano et al, 2014; Smith, 2000; Reid, 2007). Capacity building can be done through a variety of channels, such as interorganizational networking, leadership skill development, or volunteer recruitment.

Internal – Membership Engagement. The third internal theme of advocacy organizations' effectiveness is membership engagement. Researchers agreed that an advocacy organizations need a passionate, engaged, and informed membership in order to be effective (Andrews et al, 2010; McConnell, 2004; Richards et al, 2011; Vanderslice, 2003; Young & Everitt, 2004). Having a strong and vocal membership is crucial to an advocacy organization's legitimacy and impact; indeed, Vanderslice (2003) notes that the "core of the pedestrian advocacy movement is ordinary people demanding change" (375). To harness the power of its membership, an organization needs to ensure as many members as possible are able to meaningfully contribute to the group's efforts (Young & Everitt, 2004). At the same time, organizational size needs to be kept in mind, as larger memberships can be more difficult to engage with on a personal level. Groups need to find a balance between signalling their openness and inclusiveness by having a large membership, versus maintaining opportunities for all members to meaningfully engage and contribute to the organization's efforts (Andrews et al, 2010; Young & Everitt, 2004; McConnell, 2004).

It is also important to empower and equip members with the knowledge and tools to advocate for themselves. This is related to the issue of capacity, as advocacy organizations usually have limited resources, and the leadership will not be able to take on every issue by themselves (Richards et al, 2011).

An organization needs to pay attention to the different ways it interacts and engages with its membership. Several authors have noted that harnessing the power of technology, the internet and social media is critical for successfully engaging with members in modern advocacy organizations (Child & Gronbjerg, 2007, Hajna et al, 2013, McGregor & Price, 2010; Suarez,

2009). However, while technology is useful, some argue that web engagement is not as rich as face-to-face interaction (Vanderslice, 2003). Others warn against the perils "chequebook participation" (when members simply give the organization money) as a form of engagement, as it tends to limit individuals' involvement in group activity (Young & Everitt, 2004).

There is also a strong focus in the literature on the imperative for advocacy organizations to properly represent the communities they serve. A critical function of advocacy groups is to give a voice to citizens' interests, particularly those that are not represented in mainstream institutions. As such, it is important for advocacy groups to represent and engage with members of different regional, socioeconomic, and ethnic backgrounds (Young & Everitt, 2004, Litman, 2014; Mayberry et al, 2010).

External – Projects and Initiatives. We now turn our attention to the external actions of advocacy organizations, and how they contribute to the organizations' effectiveness. One of the themes that emerged in the literature was a focus on the projects, initiatives and strategies that are undertaken by organizations – ie, what groups choose to actually do, and how these choices contribute to accomplishing their mission.

Researchers have noted that the activities an organization chooses to do depend on its size, capacity, values, financial resources, and the sociopolitical environment in which it operates. These activities may change over time as the organization evolves (Halpin, 2014; Jun & Shiau, 2012; McConnell, 2004; Vanderslice, 2003). Some organizations may choose to focus on advocacy by working alongside government authorities; others may take a more "activist" approach and pressure the government publicly for change. Groups may focus on providing direct programming, organizing events, providing services for fees, or educating the public. These projects and strategies may change as the group expands or contracts; narrows or broadens its constituency; increases or decreases its financial resources; or changes its leadership. Some scholars have suggested that advocacy organizations follow the same principles as evolutionary theme; that they must adapt their strategies activities to fulfil their "policy niche" within the community (Prakash & Gugerty, 2010; Halpin 2014).

From the literature on pedestrian advocacy outcomes, the organizations studied focused mostly on collaborative advocacy, and focused on persuading government officials to invest in infrastructure improvements for pedestrians (Bergman et al, 2002; Lyons et al, 2013; Richards et al, 2011). These studies all emphasized the importance of using evidence-based arguments to effectively advocate for change.

External – Public Reach. The second aspect of external effectiveness identified in the literature was the organization's ability to get its message to resonate with the public. Generating significant public support for a cause can force governments to pay attention, leading to more effective advocacy (Reid, 2007). Researchers also note that building a good reputation for the organization as a powerful advocate and making it a recognizable name in the community gives the organization credibility and legitimacy, which in turn can generate the leverage and influence it needs to be successful (Daly, 2011; Reid, 2007; Smith, 2000).

However, other authors point out that outreach can be a costly endeavor, and can add to the capacity issues of organizations, particularly for small, volunteer-run advocacy groups (Young & Everitt, 2004; Andrews et al, 2010). This is an important trade-off for advocacy organizations to consider.

There are different ways an organization can reach the public with its message, such as advertising, participating in public events, conducting campaigns, and networking (Daly, 2011). Harnessing the internet and social media is critical for modern advocacy organizations, as using technology is a cheap and effective way to broadcast messages and connect with key people (Child & Gronbjerg, 2007; Hajna et al, 2013; McGregor & Price, 2010).

External – Relationships with Policymakers and Other Organizations. The third and final theme that emerged in the literature with respect to organizations' external functions was their relationship with policymakers and other organizations within the community. As mentioned previously, studies of pedestrian advocacy revealed a highly collaborative approach to advocacy efforts. Many other authors also emphasize the importance of maintaining respectful relationships with government and decision-makers (Ruggiano et al, 2014; Young & Everitt, 2004; Reid, 2007). Demonstrating a rich understanding how governments make decisions and developing relationships with key government personnel can significantly strengthen the credibility of the organization (Reid, 2007, Ruggiano et al, 2014).

While collaborative approaches were predominant in the existing literature on pedestrian advocacy, advocacy scholars note that taking a public stance against a decision by policymakers may be effective in some circumstances, depending on the issue. However, when taking a dissenting approach, advocacy organizations must be careful not to damage relationships with policymakers and jeopardize long-term collaborative efforts (Daly, 2011; Reid, 2007).

Advocacy organizations' relationships with other organizations in the community are also very important in determining effectiveness. Building coalitions with like-minded groups and winning the support of well-known and well-connected community leaders is essential to increasing the capacity, legitimacy and impact of advocacy organizations (Ruggiano et al, 2014; Daly, 2011).

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research is to identify specific actions for the client to take to become a more effective pedestrian advocacy organization. To answer the research question, two main methods of qualitative analysis were used. First, a literature review was undertaken to examine trends in pedestrian advocacy, and identify what existing studies indicate about the key organizational elements that lead to effective advocacy. The literature was analyzed for key themes related to the effectiveness of advocacy organizations, which helped identify the key areas that need to be addressed in order for effectiveness to be maximized. This analysis was used to build a conceptual framework, by which the key areas of pedestrian advocacy effectiveness are categorized and understood for this research. Second, interviews with pedestrian advocacy organizations were undertaken to investigate how pedestrian advocacy organizations are structured, what specific internal and external actions they take, and where they have experienced successes and failures. The two analyses were then combined to form specific recommendations for the client, based on the key theme areas identified in the literature and the experiences of the pedestrian advocacy organizations consulted in the interviews.

Literature Review

The literature review is composed of three main sections: (1) a review of the literature on organizational effectiveness for non-profits, advocacy groups, and volunteer groups in general, (2) Studies of pedestrian advocacy specifically, and (3) elements of advocacy effectiveness. While there is a large body of research on walkability in general, and some research on pedestrian advocacy outcomes, there was a research gap in the area of organizational structure and governance (ie, the internal components) of pedestrian advocacy groups. Therefore, the literature on advocacy groups in general was consulted for the purpose of identifying internal component themes. Academic databases (primarily UVic's Library Summon database) were searched using keywords such as pedestrian advocacy, non-profit organizational effectiveness, walkability, and the like. The most common themes related to advocacy organizational effectiveness were identified, and used to build the conceptual framework. This framework was used, in conjunction with the consultation sessions with the client, to build a list of questions to ask pedestrian advocacy organizations in for the primary research portion of this report. Some of the literature review findings were also used to develop and support the recommended actions presented in section 5.

Interviews

Interviews with representatives of North American pedestrian advocacy organizations were conducted to identify common practices in pedestrian advocacy. This primary research was necessary because of the gap in research on pedestrian advocacy organizations, and helped to corroborate the findings from the literature on advocacy groups in general.

Because pedestrian advocacy effectiveness is a complex subject, and because pedestrian advocacy organizations differ in their environments, structures and activities, a semi-structured format was used for the interviews. The main advantage of this interviewing style is that it

ensures that the theme areas identified in the conceptual framework are covered, but also allows flexibility within the interview to follow up on certain questions, and to engage in a dialogue with the participants to gain a richer understanding of the subject matter (Rapley, 2001). An interview script was used, and several questions from each of the six theme areas identified in the conceptual framework were asked for each interview, but follow-up questions were occasionally incorporated when the discussion warranted it. Detailed notes were taken during the interviews. Most interviews lasted approximately one hour, and all were conducted by telephone.

Sampling. Potential research participants were identified by conducting internet searches for pedestrian advocacy organizations in North America, and through umbrella organizations such as Canada Walks and America Walks. The organizations' websites were consulted to determine the nature of their activities and identify contact information, and an email invitation to participate in the research was sent to groups that matched selection criteria. The sample was limited to active non-profit, non-government organizations based in North America, with a primary focus on advocating for pedestrians' interests on at a local level. The sample includes organizations from 10 different cities, and the groups vary in size, resources, mission and activities. There are many groups that combine pedestrian advocacy with other issues, such as cycling or traffic safety. However, because the existence of other issues in advocacy groups can sometimes obfuscate or drown out the pedestrian component, the client wanted the research to be restricted to organizations that focus solely on pedestrian advocacy. Therefore, these "combination" groups were excluded from the sample, and only pedestrian advocacy organizations were included.

18 organizations were invited to participate in the research, and ten representatives were interviewed. All held senior leadership positions within their respective organizations, with the ability to provide informed insight on the activities, structure and history of the organization.

Themes and Questions. To draft the interview questions, a series of consultation sessions were held with the Walk On, Victoria Steering Committee to identify issues they are facing, and areas where they want to improve, and particular areas where they want to find out more about what other pedestrian advocacy organizations are doing. Questions were formulated to address these issues, and then sorted into theme areas. The theme areas and questions were further refined after reviewing the literature on advocacy organizations and building the conceptual framework.

Data Analysis. Once the interview data had been collected, interview notes were reviewed and coded into themes. Once themes had been identified within each theme area as described in the conceptual framework, the number of responses associated with each them were tallied. The themes are summarized in tables in the Interview Findings section, with a separate table for each topic of discussion. The number of responses received for each theme is indicated. Below each table, a full description of the findings is presented, with specific examples given by respondents.

Interview findings were then used to formulate recommended actions for the client to consider, based on the client's particular context. Findings from the literature review were also used to support the recommendations. Recommendations were not necessarily based on "how many" organizations or academic papers identified a particular theme – but rather, how well specific actions or ideas fit into the client's current organizational context. For example, only two respondents reported having formed partnerships with local universities, but given the local context (Victoria has two post-secondary institutions) and the client's need for research, it made sense to recommend this strategy to the client.

Limitations

There are some limitations to this methodological approach. The literature and interview findings reflect the experiences thus far of certain pedestrian advocacy organizations, but they must be considered within individual contexts and are not necessarily "generalizable" in the sense of proving a hypothesis. The recommendations draw on the findings and literature, but also must consider the specific contexts of the interview respondents and academic studies compared with those of the client.

The interviewed pedestrian advocacy organizations have some difference in their priorities and areas of focus than those of the client. to the client. For example, some are concerned primarily with safety, others with building vibrant neighbourhoods, still others with walking infrastructure. This can affect what they choose to focus their energies on, and the tactics they choose to use. Groups function in different social, political and economic environments, which may also influence the way they operate. Some organizations have only existed for a short period of time and therefore only have a small amount of experience to draw on. There may be have been some bias present for certain responses, such as those questions about the perceived effectiveness of the organization in achieving its goals. These factors should all be kept in mind when interpreting the findings.

While the analysis and recommendations provide insight into certain trends in pedestrian advocacy, the client should be careful when interpreting these recommendations in consideration of the constantly changing conditions in which their organization operates.

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Introduction

Representatives from four Canadian organizations and six US-based groups were interviewed for this research. Interviewees were all senior decision-makers within their organizations who could speak knowledgably about the organization's structure, activities and history. Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured format, allowing for flexibility to explore some issues in greater detail through follow up questions and deeper discussion. This facilitated a richer understanding of the particular contexts in which each organization operates, and the unique challenges and opportunities which these contexts present. Prior to each interview, I reviewed the website of the organization to get a basic understanding of how the group operates and some of its current issues, activities and projects. This knowledge helped to guide the discussion.

Questions covering a variety of topics were asked within each of the six theme areas outlined in the Conceptual Framework. Because some of the material deals with controversial subject matter, the identity of the respondents and their organizations is not revealed; findings are discussed in general terms only. Findings for each topic are summarized in tables, with each row of the table containing a themed response (bolded) along with some paraphrased examples illustrating the response. The number of participants that mentioned each themed response is indicated in the right hand column of the tables.

General Information

All of respondent organizations interviewed for this project are pedestrian advocacy organizations, with a primary focus on protecting and serving the interests of pedestrians and promoting better walkability in their communities. Three organizations evolved out of other more broadly-focused active transportation advocacy groups. Two of the US groups started as grassroots volunteer groups, and then later incorporated as non-profit organizations.

Some organizations represent small communities (20,000 people), while others identify entire states as their constituencies. Different groups choose to emphasize different aspects of walkability. Some are focused on pedestrian safety, some concentrate on livability and aesthetics, and others focus on health or environmental benefits. Seven of the organizations are incorporated or officially registered as non-profits, while three are unincorporated. One respondent's organization is run by a single person. Six of the seven incorporated organizations have paid staff members, while the unincorporated groups are all volunteer-run. The US-based organizations are all incorporated as non-profits and have sizable budgets; all but one Canadian group is unincorporated, and most have few or no financial resources. Most of the US-based groups are incorporated as 501(c)(3) non-profits organizations, which means they have been approved by the Internal Revenue Service to be tax-exempt under the terms of section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The organizations range in age from under two years to multiple decades of activity. The longest-serving organization that was interviewed has been active for 26 years, and claims to be the oldest pedestrian advocacy in the United States. The Canadian organizations that were interviewed were substantially younger; all have started within the last five years.

Most respondents reported that from the beginning, they enjoyed broad support for the establishment of a pedestrian advocacy organization. One Canadian group emphasized the importance of getting buy-in from the municipal government and other advocacy organizations in the community. They wanted to make sure they weren't "stepping on any toes" by starting up a new advocacy group; moreover, they wanted to ensure there was a need in the community for a pedestrian advocacy organization. Another group credited the local cycling advocacy group with helping the organization get off the ground by providing connections, resources and expertise.

Governance and Structure

Leadership Structure. Respondents were asked about how the leadership in their organization is structured, and who makes key decisions, and work is organized and delegated. Results are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2 – LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE

Theme	Number of Responses
Board of Directors/Steering Committee – primarily strategic advisory role, some members also do day-to-day volunteer work	9
Paid Staff Members – primarily day-to-day work, some input into strategic decisions	6
Subcommittees for specific organizational activities – split into theme areas, different member responsible for each sub-committee, creates accountability and ensures core bases are covered	3
No formal organization – group consists solely of one individual who doesn't want to spend time on maintaining an organization, but just wants to focus on the issues.	1

Most organizations that were interviewed have a formalized leadership structure, with steering committees and/or boards of directors that direct the work of the group. The size of the decision-making entities varies from just two individuals to as many as 19. Of the organization that have paid staff members, one has nine employees, three have four employees, and two have just one employee.

Of the four Canadian organizations that were interviewed, three have a single decision-making entity (a steering committee or board of directors) that do both high-level, strategic work as well as day-to-day work. One Canadian agency is composed of a single individual. That individual

decided against forming an organization, as he wanted to focus solely on the work itself and not get distracted by the additional requirements of managing a group of volunteers.

The US-based respondents, by contrast, are much larger organizations and all have paid staff members, who report to a board of directors. Generally, these respondents indicated that staff are responsible for delivering the on-the-ground work of the organization, such as running programs, planning events, maintaining website and social media, preparing budgets, writing position papers, and doing fundraising. Boards of directors, in general, provide more of a strategic advisory role, such as setting organizational goals and priorities, engaging in strategic planning, providing direction on major initiatives, and making decisions on significant issues. However, in many organizations there is overlap in these roles. For example, one respondent indicated staff provide significant input on the strategic direction of the organization. In a different group, there is currently only one paid staff member, so many of the board members do significant quantities of on-the-ground volunteer work. Another respondent noted that while some overlap occurs, it is important to maintain some degree of hierarchy within the organization to maintain order. The board of directors for that group used to participate in a lot of hands-on work, but they now focus mainly on providing strategic direction and advice.

Three organizations further divide their work into sub-committees, each focusing on a different aspect of the group's work. One Canadian group, which has five steering committee members, designates a specific member to lead initiatives in an externally-focused theme area (urban design, safety, health and wellness, accessibility, and maintenance). One of the US-based groups, by contrast, has four internally-focused subcommittees responsible for governance, financial audit, fundraising, and policy.

Decision-Making Process. Respondents were asked how decisions are made within the organization, both in the short term and in the long term. Results are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3 – DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Theme	Number of Responses
Consensus-based decision-making – arriving at decisions through respectful discussion and debate, rather than a formal voting process. Everybody is usually on the same page. Occasionally may take votes on contentious issues.	9
Periodically engage in strategic planning – setting out high-level goals, objectives and strategies for the organization for the next several years. Keeping the organization focused on its mission, making sure its activities align with and support the mission.	6
Empower staff to make decisions – delegate as much decision-making as possible to on-the-ground staff. Build leadership at all levels of the organization.	4

Have a document that outlines the decision-making structure and process (e.g. terms of reference, bylaws, charter, etc.) – outlines roles and responsibilities, steering committee composition requirements, etc.	3

Nearly all respondents reported that their organizations almost always arrive at decisions through a consensus-based decision-making model. Some participants said their groups occasionally take formal votes on contentious issues, but they are usually able to arrive at a consensus after a respectful discussion or debate. One respondent said that consensus usually occurs, but at the same time it is important for the organization to have an established decision-making hierarchy so that order can be kept.

In terms of strategic planning, there was a clear difference between the large US-based organizations and the smaller Canadian organizations. All six US organizations reported that they regularly do strategic planning, while none of the Canadian groups said they did, though one expressed that they were attempting to put a strategic plan together. The frequency of strategic planning for the US groups varies. One respondent reported that their group aims for yearly reviews, while the others reported a three-to-five year time frame.

The participants' strategic plans, generally, outline the mission, vision, and values of the organization; set goals in specific areas (such as community engagement, policy change, business development, internal development, research, etc); set out project selection criteria; conduct SWOT analysis; etc.)

Four respondents indicated their organization has a written document such as a terms of reference, charter, or set of bylaws that outlines the governance structure, decision-making process, process for bringing in new steering committee members, etc. Three organizations emphasized the importance of empowering on-the-ground staff to make decisions and have input in the strategic direction of the group.

Succession Planning Activities. Respondents were asked about the extent to which they plan for the renewal of key leadership positions, and specific strategies they use to accomplish this. Results are summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 4 – SUCCESSION PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Theme	Number of Responses
Little or no succession planning done – organization is still young, and limited resources to dedicate to long-term initiatives. Have done some thinking about it.	6

Formal process for bringing in new board/steering committee members – regular calls for applications, resume and questionnaire required, focus on diverse skill sets and backgrounds, making sure candidates are dedicated and a good fit for the organization. Networking with key people in the community can increase interest in the group and expand pool of potential board candidates	4
Leadership responsibilities are spread out and rotated amongst the group – ensures leadership is fostered throughout the organization, making sure the group doesn't rely on any one person, to avoid "founder's syndrome"	4
Expanding fundraising activities - ensuring the organization is well-supported financially by stable and reliable funding sources.	2

When asked about succession planning activities, many respondents indicated their organizations had done little to no succession planning. Organizational youth and lack of resources and capacity were the most commonly cited reasons for not having done any substantial succession planning. One US-based respondent noted that while they had put some thinking into succession planning, their priority was on growing the organization and building capacity, and that longer term initiatives like succession planning would likely come later on in the organization's development.

Despite this, four organizations do have formalized processes for bringing in new board or steering committee members. One group imposes three-year term limits for board members, and puts out regular recruitment calls for board members via their website. This call lists specific skills they are looking for, and includes a formal application process requiring candidates to fill out a questionnaire and submit a resume. Several organizations pay close attention to the skills, backgrounds and community representation that they desire in their groups' leadership. One US-based group uses a "board matrix" that identifies a cross-section of board members according race, gender, age, geographic area represented, and area of expertise/background.

Two groups noted the importance of expanding and diversifying fundraising sources to ensure the organization is well-supported in the long term. One also identified networking with key people in the community as an essential strategy for succession planning, as it is crucial for advocacy groups to maintain the support of influential people in the community in order to ensure their legitimacy and long-term survival.

The experience of one Canadian organization illustrates the importance of succession planning. The group was founded by a local city councilor who was passionate about walkability and wanted a stronger voice for pedestrians in the city. The councilor had a very hands-on approach, providing nearly all the direction for the group. She developed a large following for the group, but members were deferential to her leadership. Once she decided to step away from the group, a large leadership void was created by remaining members. A steering committee

was created in an attempt to fill this void, but finding committed steering committee members has and continues to be a struggle for the group.

The interviewee for this group described the membership as not being "advocacy-minded". Members believe in the cause, but do not necessarily have the skills or interest to identify solutions, organize and effect change. The deference to the founder's leadership over the years meant that the membership became dependent on one person, leading to a vacuum of responsibility when that person eventually left the organization. This story demonstrates how critical it is for organizations to build a strong succession plan, so that the long-term success of the organization is not jeopardized when one or two of its leaders decide to leave.

Accountability and Transparency Measures. Respondents were asked how their organizations are held accountable to their membership and constituencies, and the strategies the organizations use to increase accountability and transparency. Results are summarized in Table 5.

TABLE 5 - ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY MEASURES

Theme	Number of Responses
Regular communication to membership and public about organizational activities – communicating via e-newsletter, website updates, and social media.	8
Regular reporting – to steering committee, board of directors, donors on the activities and finances of the organization, how well it is achieving its goals and mission.	6
Open meetings to the public, allowing anyone to come and listen and contribute to the group's discussion facilitates transparency.	2
Use an input-output model to identify lines of accountability – understanding the organization's flows of inputs and outputs helps to pinpoint more precisely where resources are spent, and how these inputs translate to outcomes.	1
Hold staff retreats - for internal feedback and accountability. Two way communication ensures internal accountability of both board members and staff.	1

Accountability and transparency can sometimes be difficult for non-profit advocacy organizations to achieve, because the goals and objectives of the organizations are not always easily measurable or quantifiable (Forbes, 1998). This was echoed by respondents for pedestrian advocacy organizations; the notion of "walkability" has many different aspects and interpretations. Further, it is hard to determine to whom, exactly, pedestrian advocacy organizations ought to be accountable. While organizations may consider their membership to include only those directly following or contributing to the group's activities, the community as a

whole can benefit from better walkability, regardless of whether they are a formal member of the group. As mentioned previously, almost everybody is a pedestrian at some point in the day, so in that sense, all citizens within a pedestrian advocacy group's stated jurisdiction have a stake in the group's activities. However, it is difficult to demonstrate accountability for such a large, undefined population. Some organizations treat their members/donors as "shareholders," but they ultimately must advocate for all pedestrians, not just those who contribute human or financial resources to the organization. One respondent said their organization has intentionally chosen to not adopt a paid membership model specifically to avoid the workload created by the need for additional accountability owed to these members. Another, which has a membership model, admitted that members are more likely to receive attention from the organization than a non-member citizen for a specific issue.

Nonetheless, the respondents interviewed for this research did identify some strategies for increasing the accountability of their organizations. One respondent emphasized that it is vitally important for their organization to be both internally and externally accountable in order to maintain integrity and public trust. They added that those organizations with specific, measurable goals and objectives outlined in their strategic plans can hold themselves accountable according to these benchmarks.

Regular communication was the most-cited tool to ensure organizational accountability. Most organizations put out a regular newsletter to update their membership on organizational activities. Website and social media updates are also used to communicate with members. For the US organizations that are incorporated as non-profits and have a formalized staff–board of directors model, regular reporting is a crucial accountability mechanism. This reporting may consist of informal weekly or biweekly check-ins with board members, formal monthly meetings, or written reports on the annual activities and achievements of the organization, or the outcomes of a specific project. One organization makes its annual reports publicly available on its website. Two organizations identified making their meetings open to the public as an important accountability and transparency tool, as this demonstrates the group's commitment to putting the community's interests first. One described how staff retreats have helped increase their organizations internal accountability because retreats have helped foster better communication between staff and board members, the respondent reported.

One organization uses an input-output model to identify lines of accountability. This identifies the organization's flows of inputs and outputs, and helps to pinpoint more precisely where resources are spent and how these inputs translate to outcomes. An example of an input-output model can be found in Appendix 4.

Resources and Capacity

Sources of Revenue – Respondents were asked where their organization's financial resources come from, if they have any, and how they go about acquiring these resources. Results are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6 - SOURCES OF REVENUE

Theme	Number of Responses
Government grants – for specific projects such as school programs, public education campaigns, public lectures.	7
Donations – solicitation of both personal and corporate donations to support the organization. Often collected at public events.	7
Contracts/fees for service – for leading public outreach programs for traffic safety initiatives, conducting walk audits for governments or business districts, .	4
Few or no budget or fundraising activities for the organization. Resources largely come from volunteer time from steering committee and members, and donated meeting space and materials.	3
Sponsorships from government agencies, non-profit organizations, and private businesses. Other organizations and businesses can benefit from having their names attached to a positive civic association.	2
Membership fees – people pay annual fees to become official members of the organization. Paying different amounts gets the members different benefits. Benefits may include receiving the newsletter and updates, free admission to organized walks, merchandise, event access, direct access to the organization's executive, acknowledgement on website or at events.	2
Funding from parent organization – parent organization collects revenue through donations, sponsorships and other sources, and distributes it to member organizations.	1

All six US-based respondents indicated that their organizations (which have paid staff members) undertake significant fundraising efforts. Annual budgets for these groups ranged from approximately $250,000 to $600,000, with an average of just over $400,000. Two of the four Canadian groups indicated some fundraising, but on a much smaller scale. One Canadian group reported earning a grant of $5600 last year, while the other collects small personal donations at events. For the most part, however, Canadian groups do not focus on fundraising. Resources come in the form of donated time from members and volunteers, and sometimes donated meeting space or materials for events from supporters.

The US groups rely primarily on government grants and donations as their main sources of funding. Grants are usually project-specific; that is, they are earmarked for the delivery of specific projects or programs, such as outreach program promoting active transportation for short trips. Organizations must apply for these grants on a regular basis, and they are often competing with other non-profit groups to get them. Donations are solicited from both individuals

and corporations, through a variety of methods, such as collecting donations at events, through website portals, hosting fundraising dinners, and organizing ticketed events (one organization hosted a 13-mile "urban hike," for which they sold tickets). One US-based group has a special sub-committee for fundraising, with specific annual targets for grants, donations and event revenue.

Four groups identified contracts and fees-for-service as revenue sources. Examples of services offered by the participant organizations include running Safe Routes to School programs; delivering outreach and public engagement for Vision Zero, conducting walk audits for business associations, governments or individual businesses, and designing and installing signs marking walking routes as part of a public wayfinding project.

Membership fees are collected by two US groups; one of the Canadian organizations is considering moving to this model. One US group used to be membership-based, but moved towards a donation model in an effort to be more inclusive. Other revenue sources identified by respondents include sponsorships and funding from a parent organization.

Long-Term Resourcing Strategy. Respondents were asked about the organization's future goals for resources, and how they plan to stabilize the organization's resource streams. Results are summarized in Table 7.

TABLE 7 - LONG-TERM RESOURCING STRATEGY

Theme	Number of Responses
Donation model – Donations are not usually as rigid as grants and can be used for a variety of purposes. Grants are often earmarked for specific projects, and cannot be used to pay other organizational expenses, such as overhead.	6
Contracts/fee for service model – more stable and reliable than grants or donations. Allows organization to leverage its in-house expertise.	4
Diversification of funding – strengthen organization's resilience by not relying as heavily on grants and/or donations. Getting funding from many sources means the organization isn't dependent on any one source.	4
Membership model – charge an annual fee for membership to help support the organization. Reliable and predictable source of income, and it allows the group to manage capacity issues better while growing its membership base.	3
No fundraising – retaining volunteer model allows organization to focus on programs and advocacy without having to worry about fundraising.	3

Respondents were asked what their long-term goals were with respect to their organization's funding model. Many indicated that it is essential to diversify their funding sources so that they aren't so heavily dependent on grants and donations. Grants are often very competitive, usually short-term in nature, and cannot be counted on over multiple years. Donations can also be unreliable. For example, one US organization receives a substantial portion of its annual revenue from a single anonymous donor. Should this individual decide to withdraw their recurring donation, the organization will be left with a huge financial hole to fill. Several groups expressed a desire to move to a service-provision model, and base a larger percentage of their revenue on contracts and fees for service. These groups believe this revenue stream is more stable and reliable than grants and donations. However, it also often requires the group to have a greater degree of technical expertise in-house.

One respondent from a Canadian group said that they have considered incorporating as a registered non-profit in order to access grant money, but that this move is currently beyond their capacity, as it requires additional paperwork and reporting. They noted that not having to fundraise frees up time to focus on the actual issues, and allows the organization to retain a flat leadership model. They have many different people in the organization who are willing to take on different roles, and they feel that leveraging this volunteer capacity is a more effective resource model at this time. However, another Canadian organization did register as a society to access grant money, and said the additional administrative burden was not significant. Non-profit incorporation/registration procedures vary by province, so the administrative impact is context-specific.

Capacity Management. Respondents were asked about some of the strategies their organizations employ for managing and expanding their human resource capacity. Results are summarized in Table 8.

TABLE 8 - CAPACITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Theme	Number of Responses
Work exceeds organizational capacity – There are far more walkability issues than the organization has the capacity to handle. For example, in some neighbourhoods there are infrastructure issues on nearly every street.	9
Be strategic about project selection – only select projects that directly align with the values and goals of the organization, will have significant impact, and that the organization has the resources to deliver. For example, choosing to provide input to a city-wide pedestrian plan rather than planning a one-day campaign to promote walking. Have a realistic attitude about what can be done.	8
Develop volunteer or internship programs to build capacity. Volunteers and interns can provide additional capacity and provide a vehicle for engaging with members and the public. For example, a neighbourhood walking ambassador program.	6

Leverage partnerships with other advocacy groups, government and community organizations, and universities to expand capacity. Other organizations often give access to significant resources in exchange for public acknowledgement or research opportunities.	6
Educate and empower members of the public to advocate for themselves through advocacy training, using technology, developing a pedestrian advocacy toolkit, providing resources through the group's website (statistics, news items, academic articles, government reports, walk audit templates, etc.)	6
Build in-house expertise and focus on skill development. Using the expertise present on the steering committee can save the organization significant money – for example, legal fees, accounting, marketing, web design.	5
Focus on policy advocacy rather than programs and events – policy often has greater community impact and public reach than events, which are confined to a small part of the city.	2
Expand steering committee – having a large steering committee allows the group to divide up responsibilities. This can also help the committee be more representative of the community	1

Overwhelmingly, respondents reported that all the work their organization wants to do exceeds its current capacity. Therefore, pedestrian advocacy organizations must carefully manage and build organizational capacity. The interviewees identified a number of strategies to accomplish this.

Most respondents indicated that their organizations take a strategic approach to project selection. One respondent said it is necessary to have a realistic attitude about how much work the group can take on. Trying to overextend the human resources of the group results in burnout and jeopardizes the long-term health of the organization. Several groups use work planning tools, such as a "go/no-go" criteria sheet and dot-planning to ensure that the group is choosing projects that directly support the organization's mission and values, have a significant impact in the community, and can be completed with currently available human and financial resources. Respondents emphasized the importance of consulting with staff before launching a project, and making sure there is a clear project lead to ensure accountability and follow-through.

Two organizations said they are trying to shift away from programs, events, and other "on-the-ground" projects to focus more on "behind the scenes" initiatives such as policy work, making project submissions, and participating in stakeholder consultations. These respondents argue that this will have a greater impact on the community since it applies to the entire city rather than a few specific areas, while demanding fewer resources from the group. Another respondent, by contrast, noted that their organization tries to balance working on on-the-ground, site-specific projects with bigger picture city-wide policies. While policy work has a larger impact

on the community, the respondent stressed that attention needs to be paid to on-the-ground projects as well to maintain a strong connection to the community. This is another example of the tradeoffs organizations must face when making strategic decisions about their work.

Many organizations run some form of volunteer or internship program to build organizational capacity. Two US groups have a neighbourhood walking ambassador program, in which volunteers lead walks, run booths at public events, and educate people in their neighbourhoods about walking. Ambassadors receive formal training and advocacy is frequently built into the neighbourhood walks by integrating walk audits, showing people what makes for a more walkable community, and how they can bring about change. One US organization uses a volunteer-matching service to solicit volunteers. A Canadian group noted that it is important to have a formal volunteer program or strategy in order to properly harness volunteer capacity. They have found that lots of people are willing to volunteer, but have struggled to take full advantage of this because of the lack of a program to support it.

Leveraging partnerships is another key capacity management strategy used by pedestrian advocacy organizations. Partnering with other non-profits (such as cycling, transit, or placemaking advocacy groups) to jointly deliver projects can substantially expand capacity.

Two groups have partnerships with local universities to expand their research and data collection capacity. One of these groups works closely with the university's faculty of urban planning to conduct research on various walkability-related topics, such as traffic calming, the social costs of pedestrian injuries, and the health benefits of walking. The planning students are often looking for research opportunities, so this partnership works as a reciprocal relationship.

One of the main factors contributing to pedestrian advocacy groups' capacity issues is individuals coming to the organization with complaints about specific issues related to walkability in their community, such as a sidewalk in disrepair, or a crosswalk in need of repainting. People want the organization to take this issue up for them, but it is impossible for advocacy groups to take up each cause, so they must be strategic in how they address these complaints. Many respondents noted that educating and empowering members of the public to advocate for themselves is an important strategy that they employ to deal with this issue. Many groups have a "resources" section on their websites showing people how to report an issue to the proper municipal department, and how to build an argument for better infrastructure based on data and evidence. Some encourage the use of technology to report issues. Many cities now have mobile apps, such as "Find It, Fix It," that citizens can use to communicate directly with municipal staff about walking infrastructure issues. One organization is currently preparing to launch a "Citizens Academy" program that will teach people how to become less car-dependent, talk to their city councilors and make changes on a neighbourhood scale. Another group has an advocacy training slideshow available for download from its website.

Expanding in-house expertise and developing the skills of staff and steering committee members is another important capacity-building tool. Several organizations focus on recruiting people with varying skill-sets and backgrounds, such as urban planning, architecture, marketing, and law. One respondent reported that their organization allows the executive director to work with an "executive coach" to help think through strategic planning and other executive issues.

Another uses a software program to help identify staff members' skills and interests, and allocate work accordingly, while maximizing the potential of staff. This also helps develop leadership throughout the organization.

Membership Engagement

Modes of engagement. Respondents were asked about how they interact with and empower their members. Results are summarized in Table 9.

TABLE 9 - MODES OF ENGAGEMENT

Theme	Number of Responses
Social media – updating members on the organization's work, sharing stories related to walkability, and interacting with membership about various issues.	9
Email list – regular updates to membership on organizational activities, notifying members of important public meetings, promoting events	9
Public events – such as organized theme walks and public lectures. Focus on getting people out to walk and empowering members to advocate by demonstrating how walk audits are performed. Face to face interaction is important for member engagement	5
Advocacy efforts – conducting letter writing campaigns, speaking at meetings, conducting walk audits, etc.	3
Tracking membership engagement through a database – allows the organization to see how members are engaging in different areas, and where improvements can be made.	1

Respondents were asked how they interact and engage with their membership. Nearly all groups that were interviewed maintain an email list to send out e-newsletters and updates, as well as active social media accounts. Twitter was the most popular social media site identified, followed by Facebook. Those with both Twitter and Facebook accounts had significantly more followers on Twitter than "likes" on Facebook. In most cases, organizations have significantly more social media followers than on the more traditional email lists. One respondent suggested that this may reflect the trend towards the use of social media as a central form of interaction – particularly among younger people. Another cautioned that while social media is a useful tool, relying on it too heavily could underrepresent some segments of the population that are important to pedestrian advocacy, particularly seniors and low-income individuals.

Events promoting walking are another popular membership engagement tool. Organized theme walks are hosted by a number of pedestrian advocacy organizations, which serve to not only facilitate face-to-face interaction and encourage people to get out walking, but also allow the group to incorporate advocacy efforts and educate its membership about walkability. For

example, some groups incorporate walk audits into their walks to demonstrate how data can be collected and used to improve walking conditions. One respondent emphasized the importance of this engagement and training their membership to be "advocacy-oriented." This means knowing how to look for issues, identify them, record them, and then advocate for change, rather than just lodging a complaint and then not doing anything about it. The respondent noted that cycling organizations have established a strong advocacy-oriented ethic in their memberships, which explains why those groups have been so successful in their advocacy efforts. Other examples of events include public talks and workshops on walkability given by urban design professionals and other experts.

One respondent reported that their group uses a database to track membership engagement – how each member has been involved with the organization, and in what capacity. This helps the organization better understand how its members contribute, and identify where improvements can be made.

Diversity and Community Representation. Respondents were asked about their organization's approach to diversity, and the strategies it uses to ensure that key segments are the community are represented. Results are summarized in Table 10.

TABLE 10 - DIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

Theme	Number of Responses
Strong organizational focus on diversity in general – Ensuring representation of key sectors of the community within the group is essential for an advocacy organization to ensure all voices are heard.	8
Racial and ethnic representation – racial and ethnic minorities are overrepresented in pedestrian injury statistics.	7
Age representation – different age groups have different concerns related to walkability. For example, seniors may be concerned about sufficient crossing times at intersections, while young professionals may be concerned about the impact of walkability on city livability and housing prices.	6
Geographic representation – walkability issues vary across different neighbourhoods and regions. Suburban areas are often need of significant infrastructure upgrades. Different municipalities may have different processes for citizens to report problem areas.	6
Income level representation – low income individuals are overrepresented in pedestrian injury statistics, and low income neighbourhoods often have significant infrastructure deficits.	5
Gender representation – important to have balance.	5

Disabled community representation – visually impaired, hearing impaired, and wheelchair users all have unique concerns related to walkability.	4
Parent representation – concerned about the safety of walking routes to and from schools.	2

Most groups that were interviewed place a high priority on improving diversity and community representation in their leadership group. An essential part of an advocacy group's legitimacy is being able to claim that it properly represents the community that it serves. Furthermore, given that pedestrian injury rates are often higher for low-income individuals and ethnic minorities, and that walking infrastructure is usually in poorer condition in low-income neighbourhoods (Mayberry et al, 2010), walkability is increasingly being framed as a social justice issue by pedestrian advocacy organizations. Also, it is important to have different perspectives contribute to group discussions and inform the organizations understanding and position on various issues. As such, respondents said, it is crucial for the organizations' leadership to pay close attention to diversity and community representation.

Six respondents mentioned achieving age representation in their leadership group as a goal of the organization. They reported that generally, they are doing quite well in this area, with a mix of younger and older people on their steering committees/boards of directors. Two groups noted that ages are clustered around young adults (20s and early 30s) and older adults (55 plus), with not a lot of middle-aged people.

The need for geographic representation was also frequently cited by respondents. Several respondents noted that the downtown areas are over-represented in their organizations, with corresponding under-representation of outlying suburban areas. One respondent said that this is an issue because while downtown may have a greater density of pedestrians, suburbs often have greater gaps in walking infrastructure. Another stressed the importance of having representation in different neighbourhoods, as the challenges, solutions and processes for change can vary greatly across different areas.

Another area of focus for the participating organizations is attaining racial and ethnic representation. Six of the seven respondents who identified racial and ethnic diversity as a key focus for their group said they needed to improve in this area. Respondents noted that racial and ethnic minorities are overrepresented in pedestrian injury statistics, and yet underrepresented on pedestrian advocacy boards of directors.

Low-income citizens also account for a disproportionate share of pedestrian injuries, and several organizations identified this group as needing better representation. However, while representation for this group is needed to address this statistical gap and social injustices, it is also needed to achieve a more nuanced understanding of low-income citizens' needs, which may be very different than the needs of the traditional, middle-class professional "base" of the pedestrian advocacy organization. As described by one respondent, low-income people "do not need to be persuaded to walk – they already do a lot of walking out of necessity, since other

options are often unaffordable. The focus should be on celebrating their walking and getting improved infrastructure in their neighbourhoods."

Four respondents said representation from people with physical challenges is important. Three groups have representation from people with mobility impairments, and an additional respondent indicated they are actively searching for someone to represent this group. Another group, which has a sub-committee for accessibility, wants representation for the visually impaired community. These people face unique challenges with respect to walking, so it is important to integrate their perspectives into pedestrian advocacy work and ensure their needs are being met.

Two groups said they are trying to get representation from parents of small children, as this group is critical to many walking safety initiatives involving school walking routes.

Projects and Initiatives

Respondents were asked to talk about some of the projects and initiatives their organizations were working on, and comment on how well these projects were working. The advocacy groups interviewed for this research participate in a wide variety of projects and initiatives. Activities are classified here in four categories: Advocacy; Events; Education and Public Empowerment; and Programs and Services. Activities placed in these categories may not be mutually exclusive and can overlap; for example, an organization may collect data through walk audits (classified under Programs and Services), and use this data to support public submissions (classified under Advocacy). However, it is helpful to frame organizational activities this way so that their overall emphasis and approach to pedestrian advocacy can be better understood.

Advocacy. Table 10 outlines the different strategies respondents said they use for advocating for walkability.

TABLE 11 - ADVOCACY STRATEGIES

Theme	Number of Responses
Providing input on general policies and processes that affect walkability via stakeholder consultations and written submissions – such as community plans, pedestrian master plans, speed limit policies, urban design policies, and the like.	9
Providing input via stakeholder consultations and written submissions on specific projects that affect walkability, such as new transportation corridors, new shopping district developments and the like.	8
Publicly advocating for or against specific policies – such as jaywalking fines or a pedestrian master plan.	3

Publicly advocating for more funding for pedestrian infrastructure, such as crosswalk and sidewalk improvements from different levels of government	2

The advocacy efforts of the organizations interviewed for this research mostly involve behind-the-scenes work, such as providing input on local government policies and processes related to walkability, and on specific projects and developments. Examples of policy and process input include:

- providing input to regional pedestrian master plans and walking strategies as well as accessibility design standards and speed limit bylaws;
- planning a network of quiet, green streets leading to parks;
- winter sidewalk maintenance plans.

Examples of input on specific projects include:

- input on the sidewalk plans for new shopping developments;
- arguing for the installation of accessible walking paths in a municipal park;
- evaluating contractor provisions for a safe pathway during the construction of a new building.

Most respondents indicated that their organizations advocate on both the broad policy level and the specific project level. The level of emphasis given to each area, however, varied by organization. Some chose to focus primarily on the policy level, as changing policies or developing pedestrian plans can have a larger effect on the community than a specific project. One respondent said their group made a strategic decision to shift resources from program delivery and individual project advocacy to policy advocacy, as this allows them to make a broader overall impact. This also aids in the management of capacity issues as there are far too many individual projects to take them all on.

Other groups find it advantageous to focus primarily on individual projects. A respondent from a Canadian organization said that while they have been involved in larger initiatives, such as establishing a city-wide wayfinding system, it is often difficult to define their role in these projects which often involve large collaborations with government agencies and other non-profit groups, and it is hard see the impact they may have had. By contrast, said the respondent, focusing on more specific initiatives, allows them to have a clearly defined role, make a demonstrable impact, and be able to claim the project as a "win." One of the US groups echoed this sentiment. By focusing on "low hanging fruit," such as getting a crosswalk installed at a busy intersection, their organization has accumulated specific accomplishments, thereby increasing the public visibility and credibility of the group. Working on specific projects also helps the organization stay connected to the community.

Some organizations also advocate publicly for both policy change and increased funding. One US group regularly engages its membership in letter-writing campaigns, signing petitions, and speaking at public meetings on various issues. Another sent local political candidates specific

questions about their plans for making the city more walkable, and posted their answers on the organization's website. In the US, 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations are not allowed to directly endorse candidates, but this questionnaire clarifies each candidates' position and priorities on walkability and allows constituents to decide for themselves based on their answers. A Canadian organization, in partnership with several other advocacy groups, is publicly calling on the federal government for pedestrian infrastructure projects to be included in the major infrastructure projects that are planned over the next several years. One of the US groups successfully advocated for a $50 million bond to improve active transportation infrastructure.

Events – Table 12 outlines the types of events that respondents reported hosting or participate in.

TABLE 12 - EVENTS

Theme	Number of Responses
Promotional events to encourage people to walk more for transport and/or recreation, promote pedestrian safety, promote vibrant neighbourhoods, and the like. Examples include Walktober and Walk to Work Day.	7
Hosting or participating theme walks, and incorporating advocacy training. Facilitates membership engagement, exploring the city, increasing the visibility of the organization.	6
Hosting public talks on walkability and pedestrian issues – such as pedestrian safety, placemaking, wayfinding, building walkable communities, and the like. Experts include urban designers, engineers, and planners.	3

Events provide opportunities for pedestrian advocacy organizations to connect with their broad membership, become more visible in their communities, and educate the public about the benefits of walking and why we need to make our communities more walkable. Organizations may participate in events put on by other groups, or organize their own events.

Promotional events are a popular activity for many of the organizations that were interviewed, and respondents said that these have helped the organization expand their community presence and supported their advocacy work. Examples of successful promotional events that respondent pedestrian advocacy groups have participated in include Walktober, a month-long event that promotes walking as both a means of transportation and recreation; Walk to Work day, a single-day event aimed at getting people who normally drive to work to walk; and car-free days. Pedestrian advocacy organizations support these events in a variety of ways, such as operating booths at key walking hubs, handing out swag, and providing outreach, engagement and marketing support.

Hosting or participating in theme walks is another key event for many of the participant organizations. These facilitate membership engagement and provide opportunities for advocacy

training. Two Canadian organizations participate in Jane's Walks, which are free guided walks led by volunteers to explore neighbourhoods and provide information on the local architecture, culture and history of the area. Some of the US organizations run neighbourhood walking ambassador programs, which operate in a similar manner as Jane's Walks.

Some groups reported organizing public lectures on walkability and pedestrian issues, which were well received by the public. One example is a "Passion for Place" lecture on placemaking and how walkable communities contribute to vibrant communities, delivered by an urban design expert.

Education and Public Empowerment. Table 13 indicates how respondents provide education to their members and the public in order to advance the goals of the organization.

TABLE 13 - EDUCATION AND PUBLIC EMPOWERMENT

Theme	Number of Responses
Providing information and resources related to walking - articles on the benefits of walkability, walking maps, statistics, government policies and plans, links to other advocacy organizations, and the like.	10
Providing advocacy training to empower people to advocate for themselves – neighborhood walking ambassadors, advocacy toolkits, walk audit training, and the like.	6

Education is a key component of pedestrian advocacy. Pedestrian advocacy organizations try to educate people not only on the benefits of walking and walkable communities, but also how they can make a difference. Empowering people to effect change in their communities is critical for pedestrian advocacy organizations if they wish to make a broad impact, as they all have limited capacity.

The interviewed organizations provide a substantial amount of walking-related information and resources on their websites and social media accounts. This includes links to local government's plans and policies related to walking (such as pedestrian master plans, walking strategies); research papers on the benefits of walkability and how to build walkable communities; data such as walk audits, pedestrian injury statistics, and intersection pedestrian counts; links to related organizations; maps of suggested walking routes; and other information. Many groups also provide information on how to advocate, such contact information for city councilors and planning departments, tips on how to document and report sidewalk issues, and times and locations of key public meetings on public projects with walking components.

Some organizations take public empowerment one step further, and provide formal advocacy training sessions and tools. Neighbourhood ambassador training, pedestrian advocacy toolkits, and walk audit training are examples of the training and resources provided by the interviewed organizations.

Programs and Services – Table 14 indicates the types of programs and services organizations provide to support their advocacy efforts.

TABLE 14 - PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Theme	Number of Responses
Providing technical services – walk audits, health impact assessments, SWOT analysis of programs, and the like.	5
Delivering local programming to support national or international campaigns – providing local support for Vision Zero, an international movement, which aims to eliminate all traffic-related serious injuries and deaths, in the form of engineering and planning, education, evaluation and monitoring, public outreach and engagement, etc. Another example is providing support for local Safe Routes to School programs, which may involve helping organizations write grant applications, updating plans, developing policy, and designing education campaigns.	5

The provision of on-the-ground programs and services is mostly found in the US-based groups that fundraise and have staff and budgets. The Canadian organizations that participated in this research, which are entirely volunteer-run, reported that do not have the capacity to run many programs, and as such focus their efforts mostly on advocacy and education.

Many US organizations provide services for fees, such as walk audits and health impact assessments. These services may be performed for government organizations, other non-profits, or private businesses. These services are viewed as an increasingly important source of revenue by the US groups, as they are more reliable than grants or donations.

US groups deliver local programming on behalf of national and international campaigns. For example, Vision Zero, a broad international traffic safety campaign that began in Sweden, has been embraced by a number of large US cities, and many local pedestrian advocacy organizations have been commissioned to help deliver the programs associated with the campaign. The US-based participants reported that Vision Zero has been very well received by the public, and its ambitious goal of eliminating all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries has helped to galvanize people into supporting walkability initiatives. Two Canadian groups support Vision Zero, but the campaign has not enjoyed the level of momentum and broad public support in Canada that it has in the US.

Safe Routes to School is a national campaign, delivered through local programming, that aims to encourage children to walk to school, decrease traffic and pollution, and increase the health of children and the community. US-based pedestrian advocacy organizations reported being engaged in various capacities to support these programs, such as helping school districts and other local organizations write grant applications, developing policy, and designing education campaigns. Respondents reported mixed experience with Safe Routes to School. Some found it

was an effective way to engage youth about walkability. Others, however, said the programs consumed a lot of resources, and found it was difficult to engage school districts and residents in the program.

Public Reach

Respondents were asked about how they connect with the public and ensure their message resonates with citizens within their communities. This involves both their approach to membership growth and how they ensure their messaging inspires people to support the group and effect change.

Membership Growth Strategies. Table 15 outlines two contrasting approaches identified by respondents with respect to membership growth.

TABLE 15 - MEMBERSHIP GROWTH STRATEGIES

Theme	Number of Responses
Increase broad membership and following organically – stay focused on advocacy and program delivery. Rapid membership growth can create additional capacity issues, and outreach can be expensive. Focus on gaining the support of key figures in the community.	7
Intentional, concerted effort to expand broad membership and following. Important to increase the legitimacy of the group. Large membership also increases the potential for donations, and ensures better representation of key community sectors within the organization.	3

Respondents were asked not only about how they engage with their current membership, but also about how they increase their membership and expand their presence in the community. Two contrasting strategies emerged. Some groups undertook concerted and intentional efforts to increase their membership. One US respondent said they have specific annual goals for growth in membership, mailing list, and social media outlets. A Canadian group focuses on maintaining a prominent presence in local mainstream media (television, newspapers, radio) in order to ensure their message is heard by the broad public.

Most respondents, however, said that while membership growth is desirable, it mostly occurs organically over time rather than spending significant time and resources on marketing efforts. These groups take advantage of high-visibility events to sign people up for their mailing lists and social media accounts, but do not worry too much about how many followers they have, instead focusing their efforts on advocacy, events and program delivery. One Canadian group noted that while they want their message to be heard and supported by the community, there is a trade-off to increasing group membership. It can cause additional capacity pressures if more people are writing in to the group asking for advice or support for various issues. This is especially pertinent for volunteer-run organizations. Several organizations noted that it is more

important to focus on "who" than "how many"; that is, they focus on gaining the support of influential and respected people and organizations in the community, rather than increasing their following to a particular number. One group noted that having the support of other community organizations such as neighbourhood associations can allow the organization to expand their reach by broadcasting messages through these groups' communications streams when necessary.

Inspiring and Mobilizing Citizens to Effect Change. Table 16 outlines the different strategies used by respondents to inspire and mobilize their constituency, as well as the specific walkability factors they emphasize in their messaging.

TABLE 16 - INSPIRING AND MOBILIZING CITIZENS TO EFFECT CHANGE

Theme	Number of Responses
Using data to support advocacy efforts – arguments should be dispassionate and evidence-based, using data such as pedestrian injury statistics, best practices, walk scores, peer reviewed, and technology-based solutions.	7
Using storytelling and personal experience to support advocacy efforts – stories can complement evidence by providing a human element that can resonate with citizens and decision-makers	6
Establishing a "pedestrian identity" – not many people identify strongly with being a pedestrian. A pedestrian identity can be established by segmenting the population and tailoring messaging based on different groups' interests. Figuring out what is most important and pressing for parents, seniors, millennials, persons with disabilities, etc.	4
Emphasizing safety – death and injuries are tangible consequences of poor walking infrastructure. Safety resonates with parents and seniors.	3
Emphasizing the equity and social justice factors of walking – low income and minorities are overrepresented in pedestrian injury statistics, and the neighbourhoods where these people live often have poor infrastructure. Presenting walkability as a social justice issues strongly resonates with these groups.	2
Emphasizing economics, attractive public spaces and vibrant communities – millennials and other groups are increasingly concerned with urban livability and alternative modes of transportation.	2
Emphasizing health benefits of walking – the health sector is starting to take a strong interest in increasing walkability.	1

Participants were asked about how they sell their message, and what factors are important for inspiring and mobilizing people to take up the cause of increasing walkability. In other words, what message resonates with people and makes them want to support the organization's advocacy efforts? There are many documented benefits of walking – but not all factors have equal weight in their standing with respect to public outreach.

Many organizations emphasized the importance of using data and research to support advocacy efforts. One respondent said that passion is important to have in advocacy organizations, but that groups must strive to be dispassionate and make evidence-based arguments when making submissions on projects. Examples of data and research used by the interviewed organizations include pedestrian injury statistics; best practices in building walkable communities; walkability rating systems such as walk scores; and peer-reviewed studies on health and economic benefits of walkable communities. Some organizations reported they are encouraging their members to utilize new technologies to advocate for themselves. Smartphone apps such as "SeeClickFix" can report infrastructure issues directly to local government authorities.

Organizations also emphasized the need to include human element in advocacy efforts as a complement to the research and data support. Several respondents noted that while data and research are crucial to build a convincing argument, providing anecdotal stories alongside the hard evidence makes the issue relatable and provides the audience with an emotional argument to go along with the rational argument. For example, when advocating for lower speed limits, one organization detailed the hardships faced by a young child's family and community after the child was struck by a speeding vehicle. This brought to life the human side of the importance of pedestrian safety, and helped to convince lawmakers to lower speed limits.

Several respondents noted the challenge of establishing a "pedestrian identity." While almost everyone walks at some point during their day, not many people strongly identify as walkers. One respondent noted that recreational walkers and those who spend their entire commute walking may identify as pedestrians, but other "part-time" walkers may not. For example, transit riders often do not factor in the walking portion of their trip. One group is trying to address this issue by "segmenting the market" and tailoring its messaging towards specific groups. For example, messaging for seniors may be centered around the need for more accessible sidewalks, more crosswalks, and longer crossing times at intersections. Messaging for millennials may be around the effects of walkability on real estate prices, reducing traffic and pollution, and increasing urban livability. Messaging for ethnic minorities and low-income families may be concerned with social justice and equality.

There wasn't any single dominant walkability factor that respondents consistently identified as resonating with people; this seemed to vary by organization. Some organizations said that safety was the most important walkability factor, since the consequences of pedestrian injury and death are so tangible. Others pointed to the equity issues inherent in discussions about walkability; highlighting the social injustice of ethnic minorities and low-income individuals was the most effective in galvanizing neighbourhoods to act. Still others said that building vibrant communities and emphasizing the "visceral experience of walking" was the most effective way

to reach and inspire people. One respondent said that the health community has recently taken a strong interest in the health benefits of walking, and as such that has resulted in a significant boost in interest and support in their organization.

Relationships with Policymakers and other Organizations

Relationship with Government. Respondents were asked about their relationship with policymakers and how their approach to working with government affects their advocacy efforts. Results are outlined in Table 17.

TABLE 17 - RELATIONSHIP WITH GOVERNMENT

Theme	Number of Responses
Collaborative approach with local government – working alongside the government, sometimes behind the scenes, to accomplish walkability goals. Often have shared goals with bureaucrats. Advocacy organizations can have a complementary role to government, providing expertise in various areas. Praising good decisions, demonstrating value, inviting officials to group meetings and events are all examples of strategies used to build a positive working relationship with local government.	10
Dissenting approach – There are some instances when advocacy organizations need to publicly point out government's shortcomings in achieving walkability in order to put pressure on public officials to enact change. Examples include protesting pedestrian tickets, keeping groups out of planning processes, and pressuring higher levels of government for funding. Dissenting tactics include letter writing campaigns, public protests, and legal action. Dissent should be respectful to maintain long term relationship.	7

All organizations interviewed reported that they frequently work closely with local government to achieve their goals, and that the majority of their work is characterized by a collaborative relationship with government officials. Many respondents emphasized the importance of maintaining a positive working relationship with city staff to effectively advocate for walkability. One respondent noted that municipal staff are often on the same page as their advocacy organization in terms of what they would like to see accomplished, but are often hampered by bureaucratic requirements and thus may not be able to move initiatives forward as quickly as the organization would like to see. The respondent emphasized that it is important to recognize that this is not the fault of local government employees, and that the group always strives to find common ground so that a positive relationship can be maintained. Another respondent, from a smaller Canadian city, noted that they often know local government officials personally, so it is essential to maintain a high level of respect and trust.

Several organizations noted that the attitude of local governments towards their advocacy organization has shifted in recent years from viewing them as a special-interest group that is out to criticize, to a helpful ally that can provide resources and value. Many city governments are becoming increasingly aware of the value of walkability in maintaining well-functioning communities, and that advocacy organization can contribute knowledge and resources to facilitate this. This transformation has been smoothed by deliberate relationship-building efforts; one group described building trust with the government by demonstrating that they could provide real value to the city through data collection, research and technical expertise and services. Another group highlighted the importance of getting face-time with public officials; for example, the organization regularly invites municipal employees to be guest speakers at their meetings. In-person meetings with decision-makers will help ensure both sides have a good understanding of the issue and of each other's perspectives.

While respondents stressed the importance of maintaining respectful, positive working relationships with government, they also indicated that they would occasionally use public dissenting tactics to put pressure on the government over certain issues. Examples of these tactics used by respondents include letter-writing campaigns, website posts criticizing certain decisions, public protests, legal action, or writing submissions opposing certain decisions. In many cases, this dissent is aimed at funders or elected officials, demanding more resources for walking infrastructure – which city staff may very well agree with, even though they can't publicly say so. Respondents said that they are cautious and strategic in pursuing dissenting approaches. When dissenting approaches are used, respondents noted that the local government should be advised ahead of time, and that a respectful tone should be maintained.

Relationships with other Advocacy, Business, and Community Organizations. Respondents were also asked about their dealings with other organizations in the community, and how these relationships were leveraged to advance advocacy efforts.

TABLE 18 - RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ADVOCACY, BUSINESS AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Theme	Number of Responses
Focus on building coalitions with other advocacy organizations – organizations advocating for cycling, transit, ecology, placemaking, and the like.	9
Focus on building coalitions with businesses and community organizations – health authorities, neighbourhood organizations, individual businesses, chambers of commerce, and the like.	8

Building strong coalitions with other advocacy groups, community associations, businesses and various other organizations was cited as a key strategy for most of the pedestrian advocacy organizations interviewed. There are considerable advantages to developing these strategic relationships, as gaining the support of other organizations can help boost credibility of campaigns, build broad-based coalitions around a common cause, and allow the group to

leverage other organizations' resources. Participants said that reaching out to local organizations and offering mutual support can go a long way to cementing the organization as a legitimate voice in the community. This is best accomplished through networking and clearly articulating the organization's mission, vision, and value to the community. Many groups noted that walking and walkability are generally not seen as controversial (unlike some other advocacy causes, like cycling), and have good support in general in the community, so it is natural for many groups to support their organization. Some groups noted that they share buildings and office space with other non-profits and that this acts as an incubator and leads to more effective collaboration.

Relationship with Cycling Advocacy Organizations. Respondents were asked specifically about their relationships with cycling advocacy groups, as these groups are key members of the active transportation advocacy community. Results are presented in Table 19.

TABLE 19 - RELATIONSHIP WITH CYCLING ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS

Theme	Number of Responses
Some points of contention - Focus on finding common ground, mutual public support, and resolving issues behind the scenes. There is a need for separate groups. Some contention around cyclists on sidewalks, and cyclists not stopping at stop signs or red lights.	6
Very positive relationship with no issues – cycling groups are very supportive and helpful.	3

Respondents were asked specifically about their relationship with cycling advocacy groups. Generally, pedestrian advocacy groups work well with cycling organizations, and collaborate on a number of joint initiatives. However, many respondents indicated that there are some points of contention that exist with cycling groups that can complicate this relationship. For example, specific issues like cyclists riding on sidewalks, and bike lanes encroaching on sidewalk space can be the source of tension between pedestrians and cyclists. Several respondents identified this, although it was generally agreed that this tension exists primarily between actual pedestrians and cyclists, and not their respective advocates. Still, one respondent suggested that while cycling groups do not support cycling on sidewalks, they also do not appreciate the seriousness of the problem, so the pedestrian organization is trying to engage them on this matter. Another example given by a respondent is a new policy that required all cyclists to come to a full stop at stop signs. Cycling advocates were opposed to this, and wanted pedestrian advocates to support them, but they declined because of the potential safety implications for pedestrians.

It was noted by several respondents that the pedestrian advocacy movement is much younger than the cycling advocacy movement, and as such, cycling groups are much bigger, well organized, and prominent in the community. While these groups do genuinely support many pedestrian advocacy initiatives, they can also drown out pedestrian advocates' voice, as

competition for decision-makers' time and attention can be fierce. Respondents said that for this reason that distinct groups are needed, and that pedestrian and cycling advocacy should not be combined into a single group.

Despite these points of departure between cycling and pedestrian advocates, respondents agreed there still needs to be a strong alliance between the two, and that if they work together, they can usually find common ground. For example, for the cycling on sidewalks issue, one pedestrian group decided the best way to address this was to support cyclists' advocacy for more bike lanes, because both groups agreed the main reason cyclists go on sidewalks is because they do not have adequately safe cycling infrastructure on the roads. Respondents noted it is important for pedestrian and cycling advocacy groups to resolve their differences behind closed doors in order to maintain a united front publicly, and keep the active transportation alliance strong.

Other groups noted that while cyclist organizations are large and well organized, they often do not enjoy the same level of broad public support as pedestrian groups do. While walkability is a fairly uncontroversial notion that most people support, cyclists often receive hostility from many segments of the population, such as motorists, wheelchair users, and seniors. Therefore, cycling groups often need pedestrian groups on their side to give additional support and credibility to active transportation initiatives.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The literature on advocacy organization effectiveness and the interviews with pedestrian advocacy organizations revealed some interesting commonalities, ideas and experiences across each of the six theme areas of effectiveness identified in the conceptual framework. By analyzing these findings and applying them to the specific context of the client (Walk On, Victoria), some recommendations for action within each theme area can be formulated for the client to consider.

Governance and Structure

The steering committee of Walk On, Victoria meets regularly and discusses the work of the group, according to a structured agenda, using a consensus-based decision-making approach. This structured approach works well, and is largely aligned with the practices of the groups that were interviewed. However, it could be further enhanced by dividing the work into theme areas, and assigning a different steering committee member to lead each area, as was done by some of the interview respondents. The entire committee could still be involved in each theme area, but assigning a clear lead for themes would strengthen accountability and ensure that key strategic areas have a "champion" to keep them moving forward. The theme areas could either be externally or internally focused, depending on the group's strategic priorities. Several interview respondents reported that this model worked well for them, helping to ensure all priorities receive attention. This approach also helps empower volunteers and develop leadership at different levels of the organization, and creates accountability, both identified as important factors for success by interview respondents and in the literature (Andrews et al, 2010; Epstein & Buhovac, 2009; Reid, 2007; Young & Everitt, 2004).

Strategic planning was another important component of governance indicated by respondents and the literature. Many interview respondents reported that strategic planning was a crucial tool to ensure their organizations were delivering effective advocacy. The literature also identifies strategic planning as an important tool for advocacy organizations (Daly, 2011; Halpin, 2014). Walk On, Victoria drafted its first strategic plan last year, with a one-year timeline. The strategic plan outlines specific activities and initiatives that the group will undertake in the next to support ongoing strategies in different areas (such as political advocacy; membership growth; and social media and web presence). These strategies support a stated mission and vision for the organization.

It is recommended that the client regularly conduct strategic planning in order to ensure the group is focused on the agreed-upon goals and is using resources in the best possible way. Most respondents that had participated in strategic planning built plans using a three-to-five-year time frame; this allowed them to set broader goals and plan multi-year projects. The client should consider moving to a longer time frame than one year for this reason. Strategic planning does require considerable time and effort, but the client does not necessarily have to draft a brand new plan every year. Many organizations simply revisit existing plans and revise them as necessary. An annual review of the strategic plan will ensure the client maintains a clear strategic focus in its activities. The client should also consider incorporating internal goals and

objectives into its strategic planning as well, such as bringing on new steering committee members or increasing geographic representation. Incorporating the terms of reference into the strategic plan would integrate the group's governance framework into a single document, and ensure that the organization focuses on both internal and external effectiveness factors. Using an input/output model, such as the one provided in Appendix 4, could help with the strategic planning process.

The Walk On, Victoria steering committee is currently composed of interested members who volunteered to take on a leadership role with the group, but there has not been any formal planning for replacing members or expanding the committee. There can be a maximum of 13 steering committee members at any time, and there is a six-month minimum term for each member. While the majority of interview respondents reported that their organizations had not done a lot of succession planning, several do have a formal and regularly scheduled process for bringing new steering committee members into the organization. These respondents reported that this process not only ensures that the organization renews and sustains itself over time by regularly bringing in new people, but also helps it access new perspectives and ideas, expand its capacity, diversify in-house skills and experience, and ensures that key sectors of the group have representation. Some of the specific strategies mentioned by respondents that could be adopted by the client include:

- Putting out regular calls for new steering committee members via mailing list, website, social media, partner organization's mailing lists, Volunteer Victoria, and the like
- Networking with key community organizations to expand pool of potential board candidates
- Setting one-year terms for steering committee members, with options for renewal.
- Designing a formal set of criteria for steering committee members to ensure a breadth of background, skills, experience and community representation
- Giving more information about steering committee members on the website – pictures, background, interests, and the like.

Finally, it is recommended that the organization maintain its current volunteer-run model. Several Canadian respondents reported delivering effective advocacy efforts through the volunteer model. The US organizations are all incorporated as non-profits and have sizable budgets, but are also much more program-focused, as they have grants to run specific programs. The US groups also reported that resource acquisition takes up a significant amount of their time. The current advocacy-focused activities of the client do not require substantial financial resources, and retaining this model means minimal administrative burden. It also allows the group to focus on the issues, rather than resource acquisition to support staff and programs. The literature further indicates that keeping organizations relatively small also allows them to be nimbler and more able to adapt to change (Child & Gronbjerg, 2007; Halpin, 2014; McConnell, 2004).

Resources and Capacity

There are a number of actions the client could take to expand its resources and to build capacity. As noted in the previous section, it is recommended that the client retain its volunteer-run model in the near term. While the US respondents reported a variety of revenue-generating strategies, the Canadian groups chose to focus on low or zero cost advocacy issues, and still were able to accomplish a lot. The literature also notes that financial resources are not always necessary for effective advocacy (McConnell, 2004; Smith, 2000; Young & Everitt, 2004). Resources and capacity can be generated and managed in other creative ways.

The first thing that could be done is simply to expand the number of steering committee members. There are currently ten people on the committee, and a maximum of twelve allowed under the terms of reference. One Canadian group has nineteen volunteers on its steering committee. Because of this, the organization has been able to substantially increase its activities. By increasing the number of members, more work can be done in more areas, a greater number of skill-sets can be leveraged, and the organization can get better representation from different neighbourhoods and key sectors of the population.

Another strategy that some pedestrian advocacy organizations use is forming partnerships with post-secondary institutions to access student research capacity and subject expertise. As noted by two respondents, university students (such as this researcher!) are often looking for research topics to fulfil degree requirements, and willing to conduct research at no cost for non-profit organizations. By forming partnerships with related post-secondary departments, such as civil engineering, planning, or public administration, Walk On, Victoria could get important research done. For example, the client could have a graduate student research available grants and other potential sources of revenue for the organization, collect and analyze pedestrian data in different areas of the city to support submissions, or investigate which type of crosswalks are safest. The client could then use this information to support advocacy efforts.

Most interviewees reported that strategic project selection was critical in helping them to manage their capacity. This is related to the imperative for strategic planning discussed in the previous section, but must also be done on a day-to-day level to manage workload One US group uses a "go/no-go" criteria sheet to help it decide whether a project is worth pursuing, based on how well it aligns with the organization's mission, vision, strategic goals, and available resources. This would help the client in its decision-making processes. An example of a criteria sheet is in Appendix 1.

Finally, the client can build its capacity by encouraging steering committee members to take training in different areas to expand their skill sets. Obviously, with little money, formal training may be difficult to come by. However, there are opportunities for free training and development. For example, Volunteer Victoria has a series of workshops of a variety of topics related to nonprofit governance that could be useful (Volunteer Victoria, 2016). It is recommended that the client explore this option.

Membership Engagement

Nearly all respondents reported having a strong social media presence across multiple platforms, and that this is a primary vehicle for them to connect with their membership, inform them about the organization's initiatives and share stories about general walkability research and initiatives. Walk On, Victoria has a good social media presence. However, formalizing a social media strategy would allow the client to engage with members on a deeper level. As noted in the literature, for members to be fully engaged, they need opportunities to meaningfully contribute to the group's work (Andrews et al, 2010; Young & Everitt, 2004; McConnell, 2004). A more interactive social media presence could accomplish this (Child and Gronbjerg, 2007; Hajna et al, 2013, McGregor & Price, 2010). Soliciting feedback on different initiatives or holding a photo-sharing contest are examples of how this could be done. A social media plan – deciding in advance what will be shared, and when – would help the client take a more strategic approach to membership engagement.

While social media engagement is important for modern advocacy organizations, the literature has also noted that face to face interaction is essential for fully engaged members. Many organizations host theme walks, sometimes through neighbourhood walking ambassadors, as a means of interacting with their membership. It is recommended the client host these walks as well. Often, respondents integrate advocacy efforts into these walks by conducting walk audits, allowing the organization to demonstrate to members how to assess a given area's walkability, identify what could be approved, and follow up with authorities through the appropriate channels to advocate for change. This way, members are taught how they can help drive change thus instilling an "advocacy ethic" in the organization's membership, giving additional capacity and legitimacy to the group's advocacy efforts. A sample of a walk audit form used by one of the US respondents can be found in Appendix 3.

A third important way to engage with membership is to ensure that the organization has good representation from different geographic areas and that key demographics of the community have representation within the organization. Most of the groups interviewed placed a strong emphasis on diversity and representation, and this is also cited in the literature as a crucial factor in an advocacy organization's legitimacy (Young & Everitt, 2004; Litman, 2014; Mayberry et al, 2010). The equity issues associated with walkability, such as the overrepresentation of low-income individuals in pedestrian injury statistics, make attention to diversity even more important (Lo, 2009). Respondents emphasized the importance of representation of neighbourhoods, age, race and ethnicity, income level, and gender, as well special groups that face unique issues in walkability, such as those with mobility challenges, visual or auditory impairments, and parents of young children. The client should work to ensure as many of these groups are represented within the organization as possible. In particular, geographic representation should be expanded. Most WOV steering committee members currently reside within the City of Victoria, but many suburban areas (such as Saanich and the Western Communities) have significantly lower Walk Scores and could greatly benefit from representation. Using a board matrix can help increase diversity – a sample can be found in Appendix 2.

Projects and Initiatives

The main categories of initiatives for the participant organizations included advocacy, education, events, and programs and services. As programs, education and events all require significant investment of resources, it is recommended that Walk On, Victoria continue to focus on advocacy. Advocacy alone can make a significant impact in the community without requiring a lot of resource investment. That said, event participation is also important to maintain a visible presence in the community and increase support for the organization.

As suggested by the interview findings, there are advantages to participating in both policy-level and project-level advocacy. While policy advocacy can have a broader impact on the community, project-level advocacy allows the group to maintain a connection with the community, be a visible presence, and potentially get some "quick wins." The client's advocacy efforts have thus far focused on advocacy at the project-level. For example, the group provided input on the Shelbourne Valley Project, the Uptown Development, and other new developments around the city. The client could look for opportunities to comment on initiatives at the policy level as well (for example, the group could push for updates to the City of Victoria's Pedestrian Master Plan). This would establish a policy presence and stronger relationship with local government. As suggested by the literature and interview respondents, the client should ensure it uses evidence-based arguments to support its advocacy efforts in order to establish itself as a legitimate and reliable source of information (Bergman et al, 2002; Lyons et al, 2013; Richards et al, 2011).

To support advocacy efforts, it is recommended that the client also focus on providing advocacy training to its members. Walk On, Victoria does not have the capacity to address every problem area or potential improvement, so it should focus its efforts on enabling its membership to advocate for themselves. Interview respondents have done this in a number of ways, including building an advocacy toolkit to help navigate the process; integrating walk audits into theme walks; and providing helpful research, data and other resources related to walkability on their websites.

Several respondents reported that they try not to focus on too many initiatives at a time, because overextending their capacity results in lower quality work. It is recommended that the client focus on only a few initiatives at a time to ensure high quality results and a better reputation in the community.

Public Reach

While the client wants to expand its reach and make sure its message resonates with the public, both the interview respondents and the literature noted that public outreach can be resource intensive, and create additional capacity issues (Young & Everitt, 2004; Andrews et al, 2010). Therefore, it is recommended that the client take a strategic approach. Respondent organizations reported that it is more important to focus on "who" rather than "how many" when it comes to organizational growth. Gaining the attention and support of influential organizations

and community leaders goes a long way in establishing the organization in the community. The client should focus on building relationships with other advocacy groups, neighbourhood associations, and politicians, and other influential community figures.

The experiences of interview respondents suggest the client should usually use a mix of hard data and personal stories in order to deliver an effective advocacy message that will resonate with the public. However, the particular walkability issues the client chooses to emphasize – safety, economic benefits, health benefits, equity issues – may depend on the audience. Many of the organizations that were interviewed said that establishing a "pedestrian identity" is a key challenge. To do this, the organization should tailor its messaging to specific groups in order to galvanize public support. More research should be conducted to determine effective messaging for each group the client wishes to target.

Relationships with Policymakers and Other Organizations

Both the literature and interviewees emphasized the importance of maintaining a respectful working relationship with local government (Ruggiano et al, 2014, Young & Everitt, 2004; Reid, 2007). The goals of pedestrian advocacy organizations often align with those with local government, so it is important to recognize what government can and cannot do, and work together to find common ground. Being constructive and respectful in criticism is important, as is praising good decisions. Another essential relationship-building strategy identified by respondents is demonstrating the value the organization can add to the policymaking process. By showing that the organization can provide support and expertise in key areas, local government authorities will be more likely to consult with the group and value its input. The client should continue to build positive working relationships with local governments.

Respondents also reported strong alliances with other community and advocacy organizations, and in some cases the business community. It is recommended the client continue to develop these types of relationships by networking and offering mutual support. As demonstrated by the findings, collaboration on initiatives with these groups can increase organizational capacity and give the organization additional credibility. Asking fellow organizations for social media mentions and links on their websites can help accomplish this goal. The client could explore avenues for not horizontal collaboration with other organizations in the Greater Victoria area, but also vertical collaboration with national and international associations like Canada Walks and the International Federation of Pedestrians. This would add further credibility and the potential to leverage additional resources.

With respect to cycling organizations, respondents reported a good relationship overall, but cited occasional disagreements. It is recommended that the client work to establish a working group with the Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition to establish a working group to identify potential collaborative efforts and sources of issues/conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and their respective advocacy groups, so that differences can be resolved behind the scenes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research was to identify specific actions for the client to take to become a more effective pedestrian advocacy organization. Based on the preceding analysis, the following recommendations are presented for the client's consideration. The recommendations are organized according to the six themes identified in the conceptual framework.

Governance and Structure

Divide the work of the steering committee into theme areas. By assigning different steering committee members to lead each theme, the client could ensure all priority areas receive attention, build accountability, and develop leadership within the organization. Theme areas could be internal, external, or a combination of both.

Regularly engage in strategic planning. Setting three-year plans and reviewing each year enables the client to plan both short and long term goals and activities, monitor progress, and change course if necessary. Integrating the group's terms of reference into strategic plans would help set out the internal and external functions of the organization in a single document. Using an input/output model could help the client conceptualize how the organizations operates, and where improvements could be made.

Formalize process for bringing in new steering committee members. A formal process for steering committee renewal would help the client in their succession planning efforts. It would also help the organization be more representative of the community. Making regular calls for new members, establishing a set of criteria for selection, setting term limits and networking with other organizations are some of the ways the client could develop such a process.

Retain unincorporated volunteer organization model. The current advocacy-focused activities of the client do not require substantial financial resources, and retaining this model means minimal administrative burden, and would allow them to continue to focus primarily on walkability issues.

Resources and Capacity

Expand size of steering committee. Bringing in more steering committee members is a simple way to expand organizational capacity. It would also provide the client with an opportunity to improve its community representation.

Partner with post-secondary institutions to access student researchers. The University of Victoria and/or Camosun College has planning, civil engineering, or public administration students who may be looking for looking for research opportunities. A partnership

could lead to opportunities to collaborate on research related to walkability to support the organization's advocacy efforts.

Use a criteria sheet for selecting projects. This would help the client manage their day-to-day work, and ensure that the projects they select are the most likely to have a significant impact, and that they align with mission, vision and available resources.

Develop steering committee members' skills. The client could encourage steering committee members to take courses, such as Volunteer Victoria's free nonprofit workshops. This would build leadership capacity in the organization.

Membership Engagement

Expand and formalize social media presence. Connecting with members via social media is an essential membership engagement strategy. Developing a formal social media plan for engagement could help the client ensure their social media is making the desired impact.

Host theme walks in different parts of the city, and incorporate advocacy efforts/data collection. Conduct casual walk audits and show people what to look for and how to record it. Try to foster an "activism ethic" in the membership – members who will take initiative to address problems themselves, rather than just looking to the group leadership to solve problems.

Solicit volunteers. Volunteers can become neighbourhood walking ambassadors, or help organize and run events. These events provide an excellent opportunity to engage with members on a deeper level, and build an advocacy ethic within the organization.

Improve representation of geographic areas and key demographics. Ensuring that key demographics within the community have a voice within the organization is essential for membership engagement. Using a "board matrix" (sample in Appendix 2) can help identify cross-sections of age, geographic/neighbourhood representation, gender, and other key groups, and where the organization can make improvements.

Projects and Initiatives

Focus primarily on advocacy, with a secondary focus on events. Focusing on "behind the scenes" advocacy, both on the policy and project levels, can foster a strong relationship with local government. A secondary focus on events would allow the client to maintain a visible presence in the community, without using up excessive resources.

Provide advocacy training and resources. Providing advocacy training to members is an efficient way to manage capacity issues. Building an advocacy toolkit, integrating walk audits

into theme walks, and providing data and resources on the website are a few ways the client could accomplish this.

Undertake only a few initiatives at a time. Establishing some "quick wins" demonstrates value to both policymakers and the community. Overextending capacity can risk lower quality of work and damaging the client's reputation. Examples of these simple actions include posting useful data and tools to the organization's website, attending city council meetings where there are relevant issues on the agenda, and posting useful suggestions to solve particular walkability issues on social media. Also, reaching out to the media to provide perspective on various walkability issues can increase the visibility and public trust in the organization.

Public Reach

Focus on reaching out to influential figures and organizations in the community, such as councilors, prominent advocates, and business leaders. Gaining their support and trust will allow the organization to cement its presence in the community. Be strategic about membership growth, as rapid growth can also cause capacity issues.

Target specific segments of the population. Some specific demographic groups take a strong interest in walkability for a variety of reasons, such as parents, seniors, and low-income communities. By tailoring messaging towards the issues that affect them the most, the client can work to establish a "pedestrian identity" and inspire people to enact change.

Relationships with Policymakers and Other Organizations

Maintain a respectful and positive working relationship with local government. By taking steps to build a positive relationship with government, the client should be able to exert more influence over public processes and decisions. Some examples of these steps include inviting public officials to group meetings, praising good decisions, being respectful when disagreeing, and demonstrating the ability to provide value by contributing data, research and expertise.

Build coalitions with local non-profit advocacy organizations. Coalitions with other organizations are also important to establish credibility and leverage resources. The client should reach out to cycling coalition, health authorities, and other groups in town with an interest in walkability, and ask if they are interested in collaboration on initiatives. Reaching out to other pedestrian advocacy organizations to share ideas is another opportunity for collaboration. Creating working group with the Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition could lead to more collaboration, and ensure any conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians are resolved behind closed doors.

Build coalitions with business organizations. Businesses support can also result in increased legitimacy and resources. The client could reach out to the Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Victoria Business Association, and other business groups or individual businesses that may benefit from better walkability to seek partnership and support.

Next Steps

The above recommendations were derived from the findings from the interviews and the literature on advocacy organizations. While the recommendations within each theme area are all important for the client to consider, many of them are complex and big-picture, and intended to address long-term issues for the organization. This could seem overwhelming, but client can take some simple steps in the near term to begin to address many of the recommendations. For example, providing input on new developments, posting links to relevant data, articles and events on the website, and filling vacancies on municipal active transportation-related citizen advisory committees are all simple and straightforward ways to increase the visibility and legitimacy of the organization. Networking with representatives of other organizations at local events can help start the process of coalition-building, while also increasing the pool of candidates for potential steering committee expansion and better demographic representation. Organizing a board member seminar with Volunteer Victoria could help kickstart the internal skill development of steering committee members. Organizing a local neighbourhood theme walk would be relatively easy, and would help to increase membership engagement. Reaching out to the University of Victoria to gauge interest in research opportunities can help develop post-secondary partnerships. These actions do not require a lot of work or planning, but would go a long way towards the implementation of many of the recommendations.

The more complex and long-term aspects of the recommendations are more appropriately addressed in the organization's strategic planning sessions. For example, outlining a social media strategy, developing strategies to increase board representation, and establishing criteria for project selection are sufficiently complex that they should be considered in strategic planning, rather than the day-to-day decision-making of the group. This will allow the steering committee to consider the full scope of the recommendations, and decide on the best course of action for each.

CONCLUSION

Walk On, Victoria is serving an important and previously unfilled role in Victoria's social and political landscape. Walkability is becoming increasingly important to citizens, businesses and politicians. A voice for pedestrians in the community is crucial, and pedestrian advocacy organizations can have a significant impact on public processes through engaging in smart advocacy practices. We have seen from the experiences of other pedestrian advocacy organizations from all across North America, as well as the literature on advocacy organization effectiveness, that certain actions can improve the governance, legitimacy, public reach, and stability of organizations. Walk On, Victoria has already accumulated numerous accomplishments, but following the recommended actions outlined in this report could help it become an even more prominent force for walking in Victoria.

And that is the critical path.

REFERENCES

Andrews, K., Ganz, M., Baggetta, M., Han, H. & Lim, C. (2010). Leadership, Membership and Voice: Civic Associations That Work. *American Journal of Sociology* 115 (4): 1191-1242.

Barakso, M. (2005). Civic Engagement and Voluntary Associations: Reconsidering the Role of the Governance Structures of Advocacy Groups 37(3): 315-334.

Bergman, A.B., Gray, B, Moffat, J.M., Simpson, E.S., Riveara, F.P. (2002). Mobilizing for pedestrian safety: an experiment in community action. *Injury Prevention* 2002(8): 264-267.

Boyle, A., Barrilleaux, C. and Scheller, D. (2014). Does Walkability Influence Housing Prices? *Social Science Quarterly* 95: 852–867.

Canada Walks (2016). National Action Strategy: A Voice for Walking. Accessed June 4, 2016 from http://canadawalks.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/A-Voice-for-Walking-May16-revised.pdf

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (n.d.). "Walkability Audit Tool" Retrieved June 16, 2016 from https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/worksite-pa/pdf/walkability_audit_tool.pdf

Child, C.D. & Gronbjerg, K.A. (2007). Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations: Their Characteristics and Activities. *Social Science Quarterly* 88(1), 259-281.

Daly, J. (2011). *Advocacy: Championing Ideas and Influencing Others.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Epstein, M. & Buhovac, A (2009). Performance Measurement of Not-For-Profit Organizations. *Management Accounting Guideline, Society of Management Accountants of Canada and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Inc.:* 1-63

Evenson, K, Satinsky, S., Rodriguez, D., Aytur, S. (2012). Exploring a Public Health Perspective on Pedestrian Planning. *Health Promotion Practice* 13(2), 204-213.

Forbes, D. (1998). Measuring the Unmeasurable: Empirical Studies of Nonprofit Organization Effectiveness from 1977 to 1997. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27(2): 183-202.

Frank, L., Kershaw, S., Chapman, J., Campbell, M., Swinkels, H. (2015). The unmet demand for walkability: Disparities between preferences and actual choices for residential environments in Toronto and Vancouver. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 106(1): eS12-eS20.

Hajna, S., Dasgupta, K., Halparin, M., & Ross, N. (2013). Neighbourhood Walkability: Field Validation of Geographic Information System Measures. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 44(6): e55-e59.

Halpin, D. (2014). *The Organization of Political Interest Groups.* New York: Routledge.

Hoehner, C., Handy, S., Yan, Y., Blair, S., Berrigan, D. (2011). Association between neighbourhood walkability, cardiorespiratory fitness and body-mass index. *Social Science & Medicine* 73 (2011): 1707-1716.

Jun, KN and Shiau, E. (2012). How Are We Doing? A Multiple Constituency Approach to Civic Advocacy Effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(4): 632-655.

Li, W., Joh, K., Lee, C., Kim., J-H., Park, H., Woo, A. (2014). From Car-Dependent Neighborhoods to Walkers' Paradise: Estimating Walkability Premiums in the Condominium Housing Market. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2453:162-170.

Litman, T. (2014). Economic Value of Walkability. *Victoria Transport Policy Institute.*

Lo, R. (2009). Walkability: what is it? *Journal of Urbanism* 2(2): 145-166.

Lyons R.A., Kendrick D., Towner E.M.L., Coupland C., Hayes M., et al. (2013). The Advocacy for Pedestrian Safety Study: Cluster Randomized Trial Evaluating a Political Advocacy Approach to Reduce Pedestrian Injuries in Deprived Communities. *PloS* 8(4), 1-12.

Manaugh and El-Geneidy (2011). Validating walkability indices: How do different households respond to the walkability of their neighborhood? *Transportation Research* 16(4): 309-315.

Mayberry, R., Bolorunduro, O., Villegas, C., Haut, E., Stevens, K., Cornwell, E., Effron, D., & Haider, A. (2010). Pedestrians struck by motor vehicles further worsen race- and insurance-based disparities in trauma outcomes: The case for inner-city pedestrian injury   prevention programs. *Surgery* 148(2): 202-208.

McConnell, S (2004). Advocacy in Organizations: The Elements of Success. *Generations: Journal of the American Society of Aging* 28(1): 25-30.

McGregor, C. and Price, J. (2010). Websites as Civic Tools for Advocacy: An Examination of Two Canadian Adult Literacy Sites. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education* 22(2): 27-46.

Napier, I. (2003). The Walking Economy. In Tolley, R. (2003) *Sustainable Transport:* 159-171. Woodhead Publishing.

Prakash, A. & Gugerty, M.K. (2010). *Advocacy Organizations and Collective Action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rapley, T. (2001). The art(fullness) of open-ended interviewing: some considerations on analyzing interviews. *Qualitative Research* 1(3): 303-323.

Reid, J. (2007). *The Effective Advocate: From Passion to Progress.* Victoria BC: Four Points Press.

Reis, R., Hino, A., Rech, C., Kerr, J., & Hallal, P. (2013). Walkability and Physical Activity: Findings from Curitiba, Brazil. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 45(3), 269-275.

Richards, R, Murdoch, L., Reeder, A & Amun, Q. (2011). Political activity for physical activity: health advocacy for active transport. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 8(52): 1-7.

Ruggiano, N, Taliaferro, J., Dillon, F., Granger, T. & Scher, J. (2014). Networking for Policy Advocacy: Identifying Predictors of Advocacy Success Among Human Service Organizations. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance* 38(1): 89-102.

Smith, D. (2000). *Grassroots Associations.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Suarez, D (2009). Nonprofit Advocacy and Civic Engagement on the Internet (2009). *Administration and Society* 41(3): 267-289.

Vanderslice, E. (2003). Fundamentals of Pedestrian Advocacy. In Tolley, R. (2003) *Sustainable Transport:* 375-383. Woodhead Publishing.

Vision Zero Initiative (2016). About Us. Accessed July 6, 2016. http://www.visionzeroinitiative.com/about-us/

Volunteer Victoria (2016). Training and Outreach. Accessed July 5, 2016. http://volunteervictoria.bc.ca/workshops/

Wilson, N., Brander, B., Mansoor, O., Pearson, A. (2014). Building a Reliable Measure for Unobtrusive Observations of Street-Connecting Pedestrian Walkways. *Journal of Urban Health* 91(6): 1129-1135.

Young, L. & Everitt, J. (2004). *Advocacy Groups.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Sample Go/No-Go Evaluation Criteria Sheet

Staff, board, and committees will use this criterion to evaluate our activities, and to make decisions. The board may choose to override this criterion in the case of severe financial or other constraints.

The criteria should be used to evaluate opportunities including:

☐ Grant, project, and partnership opportunities

☐ Proposed programs and activities

☐ Budget decisions

☐ Proposed policy positions

1. MISSION: Is it consistent with the organization's mission and strategic goals?

To avoid mission creep, a project that is on the edge of scope should only be pursued in partnership with another organization.

2. HUMAN RESOURCES: Does the organization have staff with the skills, knowledge, and capacity to complete it?

Committed board members or committee volunteers may take the place of staff in some situations.

3. FINANCIAL RESOURCES: Does or will the organization have the resources to support the activities?

We need to consider how it is funded, whether it will generate revenue, and how it fits into our financial plans. It is important that we consider all fees including sub-consultants and if we need to front activities before being reimbursed. In addition, we need to review the opportunity cost of taking on this activity over another.

4. RECOGNITION: Will the organization receive recognition for it?

It is important that the organization receive publicity and not just be an invisible pass-through for subcontracting.

Appendix 2: Sample Board Matrix

Current Board Members	GENDER/AGE							GEOGRAPHIC AREA REPRESENTED							AREA OF EXPERTISE/BACKGROUND											SPECIAL GROUPS				
	Female	Male	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	Downtown Victoria	Saanich	Oak Bay	Western Communities	Fernwod	Esquimalt	Fairfield	Transportation Planning	Law Enforcement	Health	Schools	Social Justice	Environmental	Small Business	Marketing	Research and Evaluation	Financial Management	Legal	Parents of young children	Seniors	Wheelchair user	Visually impaired	Hearing impaired
Member 1		X		X				X									X													
Member 2	X			X					X										X		X						X			
Member 3	X				X							X													X					X
Member 4	X			X							X				X		X		X	X		X							X	
Member 5					X					X								X												
Member 6		X											X		X	X					X						X			
Member 7		X				X								X																
Member 8	X			X				X								X			X			X				X				
Member 9		X				X				X					X			X											X	
Member 10		X					X					X			X							X	X	X	X					

68

Appendix 3: Sample Walkability Audit Form

From the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's "Walkability Audit Tool" - https://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/worksite-pa/pdf/walkability_audit_tool.pdf

Location: _____ Date: _____

A. Pedestrian Facilities (High): presence of a suitable walking surface, such as a sidewalk or path.
1 No permanent facilities; pedestrians walk in roadway or on dirt path
2
3 Continuous sidewalk on both sides of road, or completely away from roads
4
5 Sidewalk on one side of road; minor discontinuities that present no real obstacle to passage

B. Pedestrian Conflicts (High): potential for conflict with motor vehicle traffic due to driveway and loading dock crossings, speed and volume of traffic, large intersections, low pedestrian visibility.
1 High conflict potential
2
3
4
5 Low conflict potential

C. Crosswalks (High): presence and visibility of crosswalks on roads intersecting the segment. Traffic signals meet pedestrian needs with separate 'walk' lights that provide sufficient crossing time.
1 Crosswalks not present despite major intersections
2
3
4
5 No intersections, or crosswalks clearly marked

D. Maintenance (Medium): cracking, buckling, overgrown vegetation, standing water, etc. on or near walking path. Does not include temporary deficiencies likely to soon be resolved (e.g. tall grass).
1 Major or frequent problems
2
3
4
5 No problems

E. Path Size (Medium): measure of useful path width, accounting for barriers to passage along pathway.
1 No permanent facilities
2 < 3 feet wide, significant barriers
3
4
5 > 5 feet wide, barrier free

F. Buffer (Medium): space separating path from adjacent roadway.
1 No buffer from roadway
2
3
4 > 4 feet from roadway
5 Not adjacent to roadway

G. Universal Accessibility (Medium): ease of access for the mobility impaired. Look for ramps and handrails accompanying steps, curb cuts, etc.
1 Completely impassible for wheelchairs, or no permanent facilities
2 Difficult or dangerous for wheelchairs (e.g. no curb cuts)
3
4 Wheelchair accessible route available but inconvenient
5 Designed to facilitate wheelchair access

H. Aesthetics (Medium): includes proximity of construction zones, fences, buildings, noise pollution, quality of landscaping, and pedestrian-oriented features, such as benches and water fountains.
1 Uninviting
2
3
4
5 Pleasant

I. Shade (Low): amount of shade, accounting for different times of day.
1 No shade
2
3
4
5 Full shade

Sum of High importance (A-C): _____ x **3** = _____
Sum of Medium importance (D-H): _____ x **2** = _____
Sum of Low importance (I): _____ x **1** = _____
Total Score: _____ / 100

Observations
1. What is the most dangerous location along this segment?

2. What is the most unpleasant element of this segment?

3. What improvements would make this segment more appropriate for pedestrian use?

4. Would it be possible to design a more direct route to connect the ends of this segment?

5. Are the conditions of this segment appropriate and attractive for exercise or recreational use?

Appendix 4: Sample Input/Output Model

Area of Development	Inputs (what they invest)	Outputs		Outcomes -- Impact		
		ACTIVITIES (WHAT THEY DO)	PARTICIPATION (WHO THEY REACH)	SHORT TERM RESULTS	MEDIUM TERM RESULTS	LONG TERM (ULTIMATE IMPACT)
Internal Development	• Organizational Structure • Steering Committee members' time	• Recruit more Steering Committee members • Develop and update strategic plans • Develop and update governance principles (e.g., terms of reference) • Engage in succession planning	• Steering Committee members • Walk On, Victoria members (broader membership /following)	• Larger and more representative Steering Committee • Strategic Plan produced on an annual basis	• Succession plan fully developed	• Membership is engaged and talents are leveraged • Walk on Victoria is a recognizable, legitimate and influential community organization
External Development	• Space for meetings and planning of events • Supplies for promotional materials • Steering Committee members' time	• Post information Social media accounts: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram • Organize and participate in events (Walk On Week, Car Free Day, Jane's Walks, etc.) • Advocate for better walking conditions by submitting input to decision-makers on various issues (paved paths, wider sidewalks, etc) • Develop tools to help advocate for change and improve walking conditions	• Pedestrians • Cyclists • Drivers • Businesses • City planners • City councilors and mayors • Federal and provincial politicians • Other neighbourhood and civic advocacy organizations	• Raising public awareness of pedestrian issues • Ensuring pedestrians have a voice in urban-planning decision-making • Addressing specific issues	• Ensuring pedestrian issues are considered and integrated into decisionmaking about public infrastructure • Empowering individuals to effect change	• Improved walking infrastructure conditions in the City of Victoria • More people choose walking as their mode of transportation