

# CLIMATE CHANGE, HEALTH, AND EQUITY SURVEY FINDINGS: GAPS, NEEDS, AND OPPORTUNITIES

By Shalini Gupta  
Health and Environmental Funders Network

March 2020

---

This report summarizes the findings of a fall 2019 survey on the landscape of climate change, health, and equity funding and organizational work. The survey's purpose is to add to the understanding of the resource gaps, needs, and opportunities in this critical and expanding field. Seven philanthropy serving organizations (PSOs) jointly designed and distributed the survey: Biodiversity Funders Group (BFG) / Climate and Energy Funders Group (CEFG), Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA), Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities (TFN), Grantmakers In Health (GIH), Health and Environmental Funders Network (HEFN), and Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems Funders (SAFSF).

Nearly 200 organizations responded: 98 funders and 99 nonprofit groups. Respondents to the funder survey ranged in size from overall 2019 annual giving budgets of \$35,000 to \$500 million. Respondents to the nonprofit survey ranged from small community-based organizations with annual budgets of less than \$100,000 to larger national groups and academic centers with annual budgets of \$10 million or more.

Those surveyed self-identified as working to address health and/or equity issues related to climate change or the fossil fuel economy, however they defined that work. While respondents represent a broad cross section of the field, the survey findings are a snapshot in time and do not reflect the entirety of the work occurring. The findings are intended to help inform funders investing and groups working in this space as well as expand strategic philanthropic investment in the field.




## RESOURCE LANDSCAPE

**Sources of Funding.** Funders responding to this survey invested a total of \$799 million in climate, health, and equity work in 2019.


**Philanthropic Investments:** Of the approximately \$1.9 billion<sup>1</sup> in total grantmaking foundations responding to the survey spent in 2019, 14 percent (\$272 million) was invested in climate, health, and equity that year. Of the \$272 million in foundation funding invested in climate, health, and equity in 2019, family foundations provided the largest portion of resources (\$183 million), followed by private independent foundations (\$73 million), community foundations (\$12 million), corporate (\$2.7 million), public (\$1 million), and operating (\$.4 million). The relative percentages these amounts represent are shown in Chart 1. Intermediary and pooled funds reported providing resources but were not included in the calculation to address any potential double counting of dollars.

**Government Investments:** While government entities made up a small percentage (3 percent) of funder survey respondents, they invested nearly double that of foundations (\$527 million) in climate, health and equity work, broadly defined. If the survey had specifically tracked government spending, this would likely be even higher. These government expenditures included a range of community engagement and local/regional planning activities around public lands, low emissions transit, and climate-impacted residential communities (i.e. coastal and those near industrial land uses). The high level of resources governments harness underlines collaboration opportunities for philanthropy and nonprofits to leverage and meet joint climate, health, and equity goals.

**Chart 1. Amount of Climate, Health, and Equity focused Grantmaking by Foundation Type (2019)**




**Chart 2. Primary Ways Foundations Supported Climate, Health, and Equity (2019)**



<sup>1</sup> Total calculated after accounting for regranted dollars.

**Ways Foundations Supported Climate, Health, and Equity.** After grantmaking, the next way foundations supported climate, health, and equity work was through planning or supporting convenings. About half used technical assistance / capacity building and a little more than a quarter used loans/mission or program related investments. Less than a fifth (18 percent) indicated endowment shareholder action/divestment as a primary way in which they supported climate, health, and equity (Chart 2 above).


**Nonprofit Sources of Funding.** Nearly 80 percent of the nonprofits that responded relied on project specific funding from foundations. This was followed by a significant number (64 percent) using general operating funds and individual donations (58 percent) to support their climate, health and equity work. Fewer nonprofits relied on funding from other nonprofits and government contracts/grants (Chart 3).



## GEOGRAPHIC VARIABILITY

**Urban/Rural.** While about half of foundation and nonprofit respondents indicated they served both urban and rural areas, there were many more respondents that were solely focused on urban areas. Approximately 15 percent more of the funders were focused on urban areas than rural areas, and about 35 percent more of the nonprofit respondents were solely focused on urban areas. As a result, the following data may understate the rural landscape of work.

**Geographic Scale.** More nonprofits focused across geographic scales, from the local to the global, than foundations. The largest gaps between where nonprofits were more focused and funders were less focused were at the state level, followed by the domestic/national, and then the neighborhood/community levels. Based on those that responded to the survey, fewer nonprofits and foundations focused their work in U.S. Territories and Tribal Nations, indicating a need across sectors for increased focus in those geographies.




**State Variability.** The survey asked funders and nonprofits to identify their specific state geographic focus if they had one for climate, health, and equity. Where foundations and nonprofits had a specific state focus:

- *Greatest Focus.* The states with the most funder focus were California, Illinois, and Ohio. The states with the greatest nonprofit focus were California, Michigan, and Florida.
- *Least Focus.* The states where there was no reported funder focus were Arkansas, Delaware, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Utah and Wyoming. The states with an absence of nonprofit focus were Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Wyoming.
- *Gaps.* The largest gaps between where more nonprofit work was occurring versus the number of foundations focused in that state were Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, and Tennessee.

While this does not include foundations and nonprofits who have a nationwide focus and may fund or work in certain states, this may indicate possible gaps of intentional focus.

**Regional Variability.** In order to get a sense of regional variability of funder and nonprofit activity, survey responses were aggregated by region. For regional boundaries, this report uses the United States federal government's 4th National Climate Assessment (NCA) boundaries.<sup>2</sup>

**Chart 5. Regional Distribution of Climate, Health, Equity Focus: Foundation | Nonprofit (2019)**



<sup>2</sup> [Fourth National Climate Assessment](#), Volume II: Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States. The National Climate Assessment (NCA) assesses the science of climate change and variability and its impacts in the United States. Not included in the Climate, Health, and Equity Survey were the Republic of Palau, Federated States of Micronesia, and Republic of the Marshall Islands (all Hawai'i and Pacific Islands Region).


This regional boundary determination allows for further ongoing collaborative thinking by foundations and organizations, based on the NCA's scientific understanding of climate impacts in specific regions. Regions within the 4th NCA include the following: Northeast, Southeast, U.S. Caribbean, Midwest, Northern Great Plains, Southern Great Plains, Northwest, Southwest, Alaska, and Hawai'i and the U.S.-affiliated Pacific Islands.

Chart 5 (above) outlines the states that fall into each of these regional areas. The color-coded ovals indicate the percent of philanthropic investment (left side percentage) in relation to where nonprofits focused (right side percentage) at the regional level.

- *Greatest Focus.* The regions with the greatest foundation focus were in the Northeast and Midwest. The regions with the greatest nonprofit focus were the Northeast, Southeast, and Midwest.
- *Least Focus.* The least foundation focus was in Hawai'i and Pacific Islands, Alaska, U.S. Caribbean, and the Southern Great Plains regions. The least nonprofit focus largely mirrored the low foundation focus areas, with the addition of the Northern Great Plains.
- *Gaps.* The biggest gap where a larger percent of nonprofit work was occurring as opposed to the level of funder engagement was in the Southeast region (9 percent gap).


## VARIABILITY IN EQUITY FOCUS

**Disproportionately Impacted Population Focus.** Foundations and nonprofits were asked if their funding or work in climate, health, and equity had a focus on specific disproportionately impacted populations (Chart 6). Foundation and nonprofit respondents to this question both had a larger focus on low-income communities, communities of color, and children & young people.



However, the degree by which they focused varied, with a generally larger percentage of nonprofits listing a greater focus of their work on these populations than foundations. The largest gap between where nonprofits had much greater focus than foundations was on workers. The next largest gaps in nonprofit and funder focus were with communities of color, and children & young people. It is important to note that within the Indigenous peoples/communities category, there is a likely greater gap given the limited scope of the survey. In narrative answers, respondents felt philanthropy needed to more intentionally target Indigenous peoples and communities, on reservations and in urban areas.

**Chart 7. Degree to which climate, health and equity funding strategies focus on organizations with leadership & decision-making from disproportionately impacted communities or populations?**



**Grantee Leadership.** Foundations were asked to what degree their climate, health, and equity funding strategy focused on supporting organizations that had leadership and decision-making (majority of board or staff) from disproportionately impacted communities or populations.

More than 60 percent of funders responded that supporting organizations led and governed by representatives of disproportionately impacted communities or populations was either only part of (less than half) or not at all a part of their funding strategy for their climate, health, and equity giving (Chart 7). A little less than 40 percent reported that this was either fully part of their funding strategy focus or a majority of their funding focus.

**Foundation Leadership Diversity.** A little over half of the foundations responded to the question on the racial demographic distribution of their foundation leadership. Of these, over two thirds indicated that 75 percent or more of their foundation leadership (senior staff) self-identified as white/Caucasian.

## Representative Respondent Quotes on Opportunities and Challenges at the Intersection of Climate, Health, and Equity

*"We have momentum to be ambitious." [Nonprofit]*

*"There is a continuing challenge of those most disproportionately impacted not being at the center of decision making around issues that impact them disproportionately." [Foundation]*

*"Don't simply increase funding, change the focus." [Nonprofit]*

*"Philanthropists are going to have to be brave about understanding how even short-term disruptions during transitions adversely affect vulnerable populations for a very, very long time." [Foundation]*

*"Extreme weather creates panic and fear and often when panicking, justice and equity are afterthoughts." [Nonprofit]*

*"There are more opportunities for philanthropy to act...creating pathways so communities/populations that have been traditionally under-represented in political, corporate, social and civil society leadership roles achieve equal representation." [Foundation]*


*"The health sector has enormous economic and political clout to lead society away from fossil fuels, toxic chemicals and industrial agriculture as health interventions." [Nonprofit]*

## LANDSCAPE OF WORK

**Issue Alignment between Foundations and Nonprofits.** Foundations and nonprofits were asked on which issues they currently focused their climate, health, and equity funding and work. Chart 8 shows the distribution of foundations and nonprofits and where their issue prioritizations aligned or did not align in 2019.

For nonprofits, the top three issue areas for their climate, health, and equity work were: environmental justice, air quality, and environmental health. The top three focus issue areas for foundations for their climate, health, and equity funding were environmental justice, energy, and climate/atmosphere. The lowest priority focus areas for foundations were in industrial operations, population, and trade & finance. The lowest priority focus areas for nonprofits were terrestrial ecosystems, trade & finance, and coastal & marine ecosystems.

**Chart 8. Primary Climate, Health, and Equity Issue Focus Area (2019)**




**Gaps in Issue Area Focus.** Chart 9 shows the difference in how much nonprofits prioritized an issue area compared to foundations. The most significant gaps where nonprofit focus significantly exceeded foundation focus (pink above solid line) were in air quality, toxics/safer chemicals & materials, environmental health, health, racial justice, industrial operations, environmental justice, material consumption & waste management, equitable economy, drinking water, emergency planning/disaster response, migration / climate refugees, energy, population, trade & finance, transportation, terrestrial ecosystems, climate/atmosphere, housing, indigenous knowledge & cultural preservation, general environment / multi-issue work, sustainable communities, sustainable agriculture, biodiversity & species preservation, food systems, coastal & marine ecosystem, and fresh water/inland water ecosystems.


**Looking Ahead.** Over the next several years, more than 60 percent of nonprofits expect their organizational work on climate, health, and equity to increase significantly. While most foundations responding indicated they expect their resources to increase slightly, a smaller amount indicated stability in their funding or a significant increase (Chart 10). While this provides a general indication that funders are retaining or increasing a focus on climate, health, and equity, it does not shed light on the amount of dollars that may increase given variability in funder size.

Those foundations and nonprofits that indicated an increase in their funding or work in the next several years were asked in which issue areas they expected that increase to occur (Chart 11). The greatest area of increase for both foundations and nonprofits was in environmental justice, though the percentage of

**Chart 9. Gaps between Nonprofit and Foundation Issue Focus (2019)**




**Chart 10. Anticipated trend in climate, health, and equity grantmaking v. nonprofit work over next several years**



nonprofits that listed this as an area of increased work exceeded the number of foundations. The largest gaps between where nonprofits expect to be more focused compared to foundations in the next few years included environmental health, air quality, and drinking water. The largest gap between where foundations indicated they were more focused in the coming years compared to nonprofits was on fresh water/inland water ecosystems. However, this could indicate similar interests, with nonprofits more focused on the consumptive aspect of drinking water and funders framing the issue in terms of source/supply.

**Chart 11. If increasing funding/work on climate, health, and equity in next several years, in which areas?**



Within certain issue areas, subcategories of work were included. Table 1 shows the key climate, health, and equity subcategory areas listed by nonprofits as ones they would have a higher focus on in the next several years.


**Table 1. Key Subcategories for Climate, Health, and Equity Nonprofit Work in Next Several Years**

Climate / Atmosphere	Energy	Environmental Health	Equitable Economy	Emergency Planning / Disaster Response	Food Systems
Climate Resiliency	Energy Democracy / Energy Justice	Drinking Water & Water-related Illness	Just Transition	Community Preparedness	Land Access / Land Loss
Climate Mitigation	Facilities (power plants, refineries, etc)		Economic Justice	Equitable Recovery	Food Justice / Equity / Access / Sovereignty
Climate Adaptation	Energy-Efficiency / Conservation		New Economy	Policing	Local / Regional Food Systems
Health	Housing	Sustainable Agriculture	Sustainable Communities	Terrestrial Ecosystems	Transportation
Health Equity	Green Building / Healthy Materials	Agroecology	Smart Growth / Regional Planning	Soil Carbon Sequestration	Mass Transit
Determinants of Health	Affordable Housing	Food Crops	Local Land Use and Zoning	Contaminated Soil	Active Transportation (bike lanes, etc)
Vulnerable Populations	Healthy Homes (lead, mold, etc)	Soil Health/Regenerative Agriculture	Stormwater Infrastructure / Integrated Water Solutions		Heavy-duty Vehicles (commercial trucks, construction, planes, tractors, etc)

**Tactics.** When asked about tactics and approaches in their climate, health, and equity work, both nonprofits and foundations had a high focus on advocacy, capacity building, public policy, and coalition building. In order to assess the greatest gaps in primary approaches, Chart 12 shows the difference between how much nonprofits focused on a tactic in their work compared to foundations. Those to the right (pink) of the bold line indicate higher nonprofit focus; those to the left (blue) indicate higher foundation focus. Nonprofits had a much greater focus on coalition building, grassroots organizing, communications/media, and storytelling/narrative-building compared to foundations.

Foundations had a greater focus than nonprofits on tactics such as stewardship/acquisition/preservation, capacity building, and litigation. This is not to say that nonprofits did not focus on these areas, but that they had a significantly lower focus on these tactics in their climate, health, and equity work than foundations.

**Chart 12. Gaps in Primary Climate, Health, and Equity Tactics Focus**



## COLLABORATION

Almost two-thirds (62 percent) of funders say they collaborate in some way with other foundation partners in their grantmaking. However, collaboration was broadly defined, running the spectrum from aligning funding on specific grants, to regranteeing relationships, to just learning from other like-minded funders.

Nonprofits were asked to provide narrative responses about what most helped them share information or collaborate across the groups and communities with which they work. The following represent a summary of their narrative responses:

- *In-person meetings/convenings focused on nonprofit needs.* When done intentionally, nonprofits reported that in-person meetings were important for developing a joint analysis and deepening relationships. When constructed well, convenings helped groups think together, develop a shared understanding, identify a shared set of values, as well as create institutional infrastructure and decision-making processes. Many respondents felt that foundations should fund convenings that are conceived and collaboratively led by groups impacted by climate change and the fossil fuel economy.
- *Organizational staff support to deepen relationships.* Nonprofits considered it important that funders support staff to build and deepen relationships in their work. Many said that building relationships required significant staff time (i.e. travel, attending each other's meetings, etc.). Many indicated that the resources for this largely came from overhead. Direct resource needs for this were considered significant due to the ongoing and long-term nature of building and maintaining relationships/trust with other organizations.
- *Support for coalition infrastructure.* Nonprofits underlined the need to support coalition infrastructure and not overburden already taxed organizations. These resources would support coalition staff, joint communications and messaging, coalition organizing strategies, and the institutional mechanisms for working together (i.e. memoranda of understanding, internal communication, etc.). This was important for alliance and movement building, especially given the differences in resources and power across groups.
- *Shared funding on projects.* Working together on projects practiced building trust and collaboration. Funding for multiple organizations was important on shared projects such as joint reports, research, case studies, storytelling, events, and webinars.
- *Investment in communication technologies.* Many groups considered communication technologies important tools when used to build trust and collaboration. Access and training were needed and varied among nonprofits. These technologies included: video conferencing platforms, email, phone calls, websites, listservs, social media, shared digital platforms, webinars, conference calls, messaging platforms, blogs, reports, google docs, newsletters, joint events, and news alerts.

## ADVANCING EQUITY IN CLIMATE, HEALTH, AND EQUITY FUNDING

When asked how philanthropy could more effectively advance equity and justice in the way it supports climate and health, the narrative responses of both nonprofits and foundations were largely aligned. Many of the responses indicated that while it was important to increase the amount of funding that went into climate, health, and equity, it was equally important to shift how that funding was targeted and the processes by which it was distributed.

"New models of grantmaking" was identified the most by funders and nonprofits as a need. Many respondents said foundations could more effectively use their power to support justice-framed capacity building among their grantees. Also important were shifting the institutional culture within foundations, increased strategic peer education, funder advocacy in public policy, and more inclusive hiring practices. The graphic below (Chart 13) shows the relative number of respondents that stated an area as a need in their narrative responses. The larger the box, the greater the number of respondents that named it as a means to advancing equity in climate, health, and equity funding. A summary of comments is captured below under each category.

**Chart 13. Means to Advancing Equity in Climate, Health, and Equity Funding (Survey Response Summary)**



### **New Models of Grant Making**

- *Deepening participatory practices in grantmaking.* A large number of funders and nonprofits identified the importance for communities impacted by climate and health disparities to be decision-makers in designing programs and deploying the resources that affected them. Respondents identified investigating different mechanisms for transparency and collaboration (in strategic decisions, trusting nonprofits to identify needs, etc.) as important steps.
- *Balance portfolios to focus more on organizations/networks led by members of disproportionately impacted communities such as people of color, Indigenous communities, workers, and the urban and rural poor.* Many foundation and nonprofit respondents felt that portfolios were imbalanced in that they funded more large, white-dominated, legacy environmental organizations and that there needed to be an intentional commitment to substantially increase funding to communities and groups directly impacted by climate change and fossil-fuel development. Some foundation respondents stated there was a need to review large grants and white legacy organization-led work for efficacy and to re-assess current evaluation metrics.

- *Greater focus on transitioning away from the fossil fuel economy and building a regenerative economy.* In narrative responses across foundations and nonprofits, there was a concern that without an integrated lens, traditional climate funding's historical focus on the demand side of fossil fuel energy work—such as greenhouse gas emissions and clean energy technologies—was resulting in entrenching health inequities. These respondents identified a need to pay more attention to fossil fuel supply including the expansion of fossil fuel and petrochemical development—such as through addressing fossil fuel subsidies, pipeline expansion, extraction, and fossil fuel infrastructure that harm the health of frontline and Indigenous communities. Respondents stated a need for more intentional and holistic philanthropic investments that transitioned the energy economy to one that was healthy, regenerative, and wealth- and power-building in disproportionately impacted communities.
- *Direct and long-term resources.* Many nonprofit respondents identified the need for more long-term, multi-year, general support funding that allowed for flexible spending. This included flexibility around deliverables so organizations could more easily pivot and do work that is immediately responsive to communities and the grassroots. Also needed were technical assistance funds that could help smaller organizations start up new projects and manage overhead and grants. Several groups mentioned as a priority identifying investment dollars where access to finance is difficult. This includes help to access community loans and financing that support community businesses and wealth building. Many nonprofits felt grantmaking mechanisms needed to address burdensome structural hoops (i.e. complex proposals, reporting needs, regrants contractual requirements) for small grassroots groups to more easily access resources. This included foundations investigating alternative options—outside of subgrants from large mainstream organizations—to directly support smaller groups.

### ***Justice-framed Capacity Building Among Grantees***

A number of respondents suggested that foundations should use their power to move legacy, white-dominated environmental organizations to be more intentional about addressing systemic equity issues and gaining new inter-organizational skills when it is necessary for groups representing disproportionately impacted communities to lead. This includes grant application questions asking about leadership representation from disproportionately impacted communities as well as questions on who is guiding key advocacy, policy, and research. Many respondents recommended that funders consider grants and technical assistance to help predominantly white organizations become more equity centered. This included mechanisms such as mandating racial justice training to build competencies and incorporate social and racial equity into these grantees' climate and health work.

### ***Institutional Culture Shift***

Many respondents recommended structural changes to align foundation endowments with their grantmaking values on climate, health, and equity. Respondents underlined the importance of endowments moving away from businesses and investments that are working against climate, health, and equity and investing in more regenerative business models. Respondents felt it was valuable for boards, executive leadership, and staff to develop a deeper understanding of the intersections between climate and health impacts and how they place stress on already overburdened communities. Nonprofit respondents suggested funders get racial equity and cultural competency training so they can engage respectfully in grantee spaces and have the skills to build more authentic relationships with grassroots-impacted communities.

### ***Strategic Peer Education***

Given the amount of capital needed to move this work, both foundations and nonprofits felt it was important for funders to do peer education in their spheres of influence. This would be meant to be done in partnership with impacted groups—amplifying their narratives and elevating their victories. Peer education could be more strategic by sharing information with other funders (i.e. via convenings and webinars) in the hopes of increasing

the pool of funding, working to find more place-based resources, and coordinating with other philanthropic networks to bring impacted communities into those discussion spaces.

### ***Funder Advocacy in Public Policy***

Done carefully and in close partnership with impacted groups, both foundations and nonprofits felt that foundation leaders could play an important role in shaping policy narratives to emphasize the link between equity, health, and climate change. This included times when foundations could move a decisionmaker or be part of advocacy coalitions (not just funders of them). Many felt it was powerful to speak with one voice about the urgency and need for immediate, concerted action.

### ***Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in Hiring***

While not as many respondents listed this as a top need, it was considered an important factor in making the other more structural aspects of climate, health, and equity in philanthropy possible. Some funders stated that it was important for foundations to reflect the diversity in which they operated—across race, age, gender, class, and culture. Some commented that it was important to have program officers from communities disproportionately impacted by climate change, especially people of color. They also identified the benefit of foundation staff having worked in both small and large nonprofits so they understood the needs of grantees.

## **CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES**

Respondents expressed deep concern that the scale of climate change and its impacts were outpacing philanthropy's ability to respond. Many acknowledged the significant challenges being posed by federal regulatory rollbacks and an accelerated fossil fuel infrastructure buildout. Ongoing climate impacts and challenges, like voter suppression and more visible white nationalism, are stressing social movements and exacerbating already difficult economic and political disparities. Some respondents expressed concerns about the philanthropic impacts on climate, health, and equity of a future recession. These challenges are occurring concurrently with a sense that the nonprofit sector is experiencing a generational turnover in leadership. Many respondents expressed the urgency for foundations to break out of historically fragmented approaches to addressing these intersecting issues.

Within these significant challenges, many felt there were solid foundations to build on. This included an increased awareness around the dangers of the climate crisis and the importance of having a racial justice lens that focused on disproportionate burdens on communities. There was an increasing and energizing activism occurring among young people and other disproportionately impacted communities. Many felt climate, health, and equity was a powerful frame to make the connection between the environment and peoples lived experiences around health and inequality. Several respondents highlighted that many impacted communities have been leading the development of solutions around this intersection of issues that simply need to be brought to the forefront. Health professionals are also beginning to add their political power to this set of issues. While extreme weather events are a starting point, a more holistic climate, health, and equity frame offers an opportunity to have a fuller discussion on the historical health and wealth disparities created by the fossil fuel economy and the solutions embodied in a health-oriented economy. Overall, respondents saw the climate, health, and equity framework as an opportunity to build a common understanding around multi-faceted, collaborative approaches rooted in democracy, justice, resiliency, and stewardship.

## APPENDIX A CLIMATE, HEALTH, AND EQUITY SURVEY RESPONDENTS

### FUNDER SURVEY RESPONDENTS

11th Hour Project  
American Jewish World Service  
American Planning Association Foundation  
Arabella Advisors / Fund to Build Grassroots Power  
Arizona Complete Health  
Arizona Foundation for Women  
Barr Foundation  
Broad Reach Fund  
Brookline Community Foundation  
Bruner Foundation  
Building Equity and Alignment for Impact Fund (BEAI Fund)  
California Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
Central Kansas Community Foundation  
Ceres Trust  
Charlotte Martin Foundation  
Chorus Foundation  
Cleveland Foundation  
Climate + Clean Energy Equity Fund  
ClimateWorks Foundation  
Community Foundation of Eastern CT  
Community Foundation of Greater Dubuque  
Danville Regional Foundation  
Delta Dental of Arizona Foundation  
DVRPC Southeastern PA Corp  
East Texas Communities Foundation  
Energy Foundation  
Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.  
Fairfield County's Community Foundation  
Fine Fund  
Forbes Funds  
Franciscan Sisters of Mary  
Fund for New Jersey  
Fund to Build Grassroots Power  
Garfield Foundation  
Gates Family Foundation  
George Gund Foundation  
HealthSpark Foundation  
Heising-Simons Foundation  
High Meadows Fund

Houston Endowment  
International Community Foundation  
Jesse Parker Williams Foundation  
John Merck Fund  
Joyce Foundation  
Kendeda Fund  
Kinship Foundation  
Kresge Foundation  
Libra Foundation  
Lincoln Community Foundation  
Lumpkin Family Foundation  
Maine Community Foundation  
McKinney Family Foundation  
McKnight Foundation  
Meyer Memorial Trust  
Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation  
Munson Foundation  
Nathan Cummings Foundation  
Native American Agriculture Fund  
NE Grassroots Env. Fund  
Nell Newman Foundation  
New Belgium Family Foundation  
New York State Health Foundation  
NorthLight Foundation  
Ocean Foundation  
Onion Foundation  
Ottinger Foundation  
Panta Rhea Foundation  
Park Foundation  
Passport Foundation  
Philadelphia Health Partnership  
Presbyterian Hunger Program  
Ralph E. Ogden Foundation, Inc.  
RE-AMP Network  
Redford Center  
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation  
Rosalinde and Arthur Gilbert Foundation  
Roy and Patricia Family Foundation  
San Diego Foundation  
Scherman Foundation  
Sears-Swetland Family Foundation

Seattle Foundation  
Sewall Foundation  
Solidago Foundation  
Southwest Florida Community Foundation  
State of Colorado, Energy Impact Assistance Fund  
State of Colorado, Resiliency Office  
Summit Foundation  
Tamalpais Trust  
The Heinz Endowments

Triangle Community Foundation  
Tucson Foundations (group of 11 foundations)  
Uluono Initiative  
Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust  
Vitalyst Health Foundation  
Wallace Global Fund  
Walter Mander Foundation  
Weeden Foundation  
Wege Foundation

#### **NONPROFIT SURVEY RESPONDENTS**

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments  
American Lung Association  
American Public Health Association  
American Sustainable Business Council  
Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN)  
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners  
California Environmental Justice Alliance  
Cancer Free Economy Network  
Center for Environmental Health  
Center for Progressive Reform  
Center for Urban Responses to Environmental Stressors  
Central Florida Jobs with Justice  
City of Sacramento  
Clean Water Action & Clean Water Fund (Massachusetts)  
Clean Water Fund  
Clean Wisconsin  
Climate Justice Alliance  
Coming Clean  
Communities for a Better Environment  
Consumer Health Coalition  
Corbin Hill food project  
Council on Strategic Risks  
Direct Action for Rights & Equality  
Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition/Technical Advisory Group  
Earthjustice  
Eco Works  
Eco America  
Enterprise Community Partners  
Environmental & Public Health Consulting  
Environmental Health Coalition  
Epidemic Answers

Faith in Place  
Farmworker Association of Florida  
Florida Clinicians for Climate Action  
Friends of the Earth US  
George Mason University Center for Climate Change Communication  
Global Center for Climate Justice  
Global Climate and Health Alliance  
Glynn Environmental Coalition  
Grassroots Global Justice Alliance  
Green Science Policy Institute  
Greenpeace  
Green Roots  
Health Care Without Harm  
Healthy Building Network  
Indigenous Environmental Network  
Institute for Sustainable Communities  
International Pollutants Elimination Network  
Ironbound Community Corporation  
It Takes Roots  
Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation  
Just Transition Alliance  
Kentuckians For the Commonwealth  
Kheprw Institute  
Labor Network for Sustainability  
Little Village Environmental Justice Organization  
Make Food Not Waste  
Material research I3c  
Michigan Environmental Justice Coalition  
Midwest EJ Network  
Mujeres Unidas y Activas  
National Conference of State Legislatures  
National Environmental Health Association  
National Medical Association

National Network for Immigrant & Refugee Rights  
Native Justice Coalition  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Nearby Nature Milwaukee  
New Jersey Environmental Justice Alliance  
Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Trust  
North American Water Office  
Northeast Michigan Great Lakes Stewardship Initiative  
Northwest Green Chemistry  
NYC Environmental Justice Alliance  
Ohio Environmental Council  
Open Space Institute  
Our Streets Minneapolis  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Public Health Institute  
Public Health Institute of Western Massachusetts  
Puget Soundkeeper Alliance  
Southeastern African American Farmers' Organic Network

Sacred Winds  
Sierra Club  
Slipstream  
Soulardarity  
SouthWest Organizing Project  
University of Louisville  
University of Minnesota  
UPROSE  
Urban Tilth  
US Climate Action Network  
Urban Sustainability Directors Network  
Verde  
Virginia Organizing  
Voices for Racial Justice  
WE ACT For Environmental Justice  
Wisconsin Green Muslims  
Zero Waste Washington

