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Introduction

The Innovations in American Government Awards Program at the Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard Kennedy School was initiated in 1985 amidst widespread concern about citizen apathy and consequent loss of trust in the government, and the concern that creative and high performing governmental programs were largely unacknowledged by the media and general public. Through the Innovations in American Government Awards Program, the Institute has sought to restore confidence in government by recognizing, celebrating, and replicating the best innovations in government.

Over the years, the Innovations in American Government Awards Program has received over 25,000 applications from federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial government programs and has given recognition to more than 400 agencies, proving that creativity is indeed flourishing in the public sector. In September 2007, the Innovations Awards Program conferred awards to its twentieth class of winners, bringing the total number of Innovations in American Government Award winners to 181.

On this occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Innovations in American Government Awards Program, the Ash Institute has sought to revisit the impact of and lessons learned from government innovations worldwide, as well as to identify areas for new research in the field of government innovation. The Ash Institute began the execution of a constellation of activities surrounding the twentieth award year, commencing with the awarding of Innovations in American Government Award winners in the fall of 2007, and culminating in an international conference to bring together finalists and winners of the Innovations Awards and innovators from across the world.

In addition to these activities, the Ash Institute decided to use the twentieth anniversary occasion to systematically survey the cadre of winning programs belonging to the Innovations in American Government Awards Program. The Institute developed a questionnaire in order to gather information about each program’s status, including how the award has impacted them, and how they in turn may have impacted others.

There have been a number of prior experiences surveying a sample of Program Award applicants. The first was a study conducted by Sandford Borins,1 who used a stratified, non-randomized sampling of 217 semi-finalist programs2 that applied to the program between 1990 and 1994, representing 62 percent of the 350 semi-finalists from this period. In this case, the original

2. Semi-finalists are those applicants to the award program who pass the first selection stage; those who pass the second selection stage are “finalists.” It is from this “finalist” pool that the “winners” are chosen.
application “questionnaire” was used as the data to study innovation. Two more studies were completed at the 15 year anniversary of the Innovations in American Government Awards Program. The first was a report by Jonathan Walters, who looked at the more than 300 winners and finalists of the Innovations in American Government Awards to explore the characteristics of innovative organizations and reflect on what inspires innovation and makes it successful. The second was an unpublished winner survey conducted by the Ash Institute, which asked many of the same questions posed in the twentieth anniversary survey. Another study of Innovations-winning Programs was a paper written by John Donahue in 2005, which looked at the diffusion of these programs and traced the success and failure of the diffusion of winners from the first 10 years of the competition.

This survey seeks to complement previous research on innovation by eliciting information on our particular population of public sector innovators. In addition to aggregating and providing brief analysis of multiple-choice responses to the survey, this report offers illustrative qualitative information from the textual responses regarding the impact of the award on the programs themselves, transference of the innovations, and the programs’ influence on legislative research and policy.

20th Anniversary Survey Background

This report presents the findings and analysis of 91 responses to a survey distributed in January 2008 to the 181 winners who received Innovations in American Government Awards between 1986 and 2007. The goal of the survey is to formally reconnect with this community of innovators and to gather information regarding their endeavors since winning the award, with special emphasis placed on the impact the award may have had on their success, program transference (replication and dissemination), and the influence of these programs at the community and policy levels.

The most noteworthy findings from among survey responses and staff contact with winning programs is that the vast majority of programs are still active and that respondents indicate that receiving the award had a favorable impact on their public profile. Most responding programs also indicate some form of transference of their innovation to other locations; most significantly, this transfer process seems closely related to the involvement of the winning programs and their collaboration with the replicating entities. In addition, Innovations winners generally are regarded as leaders in their fields and communities, and the programs that they represent continue to win awards and garner significant amounts of press attention and research.


Context

The Program

The Innovations in American Government Awards is an awards program of the Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard Kennedy School. It strives to identify and celebrate outstanding examples of creative problem-solving in the public sector.

Since its inception in 1985, the program has recognized over 400 innovative programs, which have collectively received over $20 million in grants. These grants fall into two categories: “winners” and “finalists.” The selection process culminates with a group of “finalist” programs from which a select number of programs are chosen by a prestigious National Selection Committee. This select group is named “winners,” and each receives a grant of $100,000. The remaining “finalists” are awarded smaller grants and receive recognition.

The Respondents: Awards Winners

The survey and this report focus on the 181 winner programs chosen by the National Selection Committee between 1986 and 2007. The finalists not picked for $100,000 awards are not included in this survey.

5. Additional information on the population of 181 winners is included in the Appendix of this report.
6. A finalist survey report will be available in the summer of 2008.
Survey Objectives, Design, and Methodology

Objectives

The aforementioned work of Sandford Borins, John Donahue, and Jonathan Walters, along with scholarly work by David Osborne, Robert Behn, Alan Altshuler, and others, has produced considerable research and analysis—on both the theoretical and individual (case) levels—regarding the broad trends, patterns, and in some cases causality surrounding innovative programs and the innovation process. The objectives of this survey, on the other hand, are related specifically to the innovations winners and developments made since the awards were given. They include the following:

**Follow up** The Ash Institute's Government Innovators Network web portal seeks to connect government innovators around the world and to disseminate information about innovative practices. Each Innovations in American Government Award winner and finalist has a page on the portal, and the Ash Institute is committed to ensuring that these pages include updated program contact and status information, as well as additional materials that may be of use to researchers and practitioners.

**Feedback** The second objective of the survey was to gather quantitative and qualitative data related to the goals and objectives of the Innovations in American Government Awards Program. The Innovations Program seeks to ensure that its award-winning programs receive significant press attention and the tools necessary to disseminate their initiatives in order to ensure replication and adoption beyond their own jurisdiction. Thus, the survey sought to find information on press attention to the program and the impact of the recognition on the program, as well as the successes and problems programs have experienced in disseminating their innovations beyond their own community or jurisdiction. Answers to these performance questions are instrumental to informing future innovations awards programs and to contributing to the Institute's body of research regarding public innovation.

---

Design and Instrument

The survey represents a non-randomized, self-selected sample of 91 respondents from a pool of 181 programs. The design reflects our intention to collect raw data, not to test any specific hypothesis.

The instrument was a written survey comprising 20 questions. 14 questions were multiple choice with space for comments, while 6 requested concise textual information. Most textual questions were designed to elaborate on the multiple-choice responses. The questions were grouped into six categories:

A. Contact Information and Program Status
B. Replication and/or Dissemination of the Program
C. Impact on Public Policy
D. The Program’s Current Press Presence
E. Role in the Community
F. Going Forward

Methodology

All 181 award-winning programs were contacted by phone at the beginning of January 2008 to confirm or update contact information and to give program staff advanced notice regarding the survey. Upon completing this process, an electronic version of the survey was emailed to all program contacts. All respondents were asked to submit their completed survey electronically. Before the survey response deadline, staff tracked returned questionnaires and sent email reminders to non-respondents. Immediately following the deadline, staff contacted programs with outstanding responses by telephone.

9. The survey is included in the Appendix of this report.
Findings

Response Rate

We ultimately were able to obtain completed surveys from 91 of the 181 programs, representing a 50 percent response rate. Because respondent demographics, with the exception of programs no longer in operation, correlated quite closely to those of the overall population of 181, we cannot identify any causal relationships between respondents, non-respondents, and any of the variables such as jurisdiction or policy type. We do assume that the pool of 91 respondents is an accurate sample of the broader population. However, it should be emphasized that our survey analysis focuses on the respondents to this survey, not necessarily to all winning programs or innovative programs in general.

Demographics

Current Status of Programs

Inactive Programs

In the course of the Innovations in American Government Program's interactions with its community over the years, we learned about programs that were no longer in operation. This type of information was captured and already part of our records. During the outreach process of all 181 winning programs prior to sending out surveys, we learned of additional inactive programs. Though the number of these programs has naturally increased over time, nevertheless, over 80 percent of all winning programs are still active.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT STATUS OF PROGRAM</th>
<th>ACTIVE PROGRAMS</th>
<th>INACTIVE PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Winners (181)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents (91)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Telephone calls to agencies with inactive programs elicited feedback regarding program termination. Similar to the survey, some programs became inactive after a change in administration or through budget cuts; alternatively, a number of early technology programs, such as Telefile in the Department of Revenue, were discontinued after being replaced by advances in technology.

Only three programs that are no longer in operation responded to the survey. The reasons given for discontinuation of these include no specific reason given, loss of funding, and a change in administration. It is important to note that in this last example, the new administration is currently considering reinstatement.

Name Changes
A substantial number of the 91 respondent programs indicated having changed their program since their award: 22 programs, representing almost 25 percent of respondents. Reasons given in responses varied considerably, and in many cases were vague, making codifying this information difficult. Many programs changed their names to reflect a broader scope or bigger scale. For example, the Trauma Intervention Program, which began in San Diego County and won the Award in 1991, has expanded into a national program and is now known as Trauma Intervention Programs, Inc. PulseNet, a 1999 winner from the Centers for Disease Control, is now known as PulseNet USA. Because of the program’s success, it has been copied in many regions of the world each with a “PulseNet” name under the umbrella of PulseNet International.

Regional Breakdowns
Overall geographic distribution of programs (also mirrored by survey respondents) roughly reflects the distribution of the US population, with the heaviest concentrations found in the Northeast and West of the country.

Federal programs are counted, both jurisdictionally and geographically, as encompassing the entire nation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>ALL WINNERS</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. This difference is between the 181 overall winner population and the 91 respondents; the actual number is a function of winners minus respondents.
Jurisdictional Distribution

State government garners the largest number of Awards (66 total winners, 36 of the respondents). Those in the federal category—currently 13 percent of grant winners—can be expected to increase in the future since current Innovations Awards have only been granted to federal programs for the past ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>WINNERS (181)</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (91)</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Jurisdiction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Regional Authority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Area Distribution

In order to ensure that each application is evaluated fairly, the Innovations Program categorizes all applicants by specific policy areas. Programs self-select a category during the initial application, and staff reviews these selections for accuracy. Given that each policy area encompasses different scopes and arrays of programmatic areas, the distribution across areas is only generally instructive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>WINNERS (181)</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (91)</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Governance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Economic Development</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice, Public Safety</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Infrastructure, and Environment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programmatic Changes

A primary objective of this survey was to trace the progress and development of award-winning programs and to determine what changes, if any, have taken place since the Awards were conferred. As the below table illustrates, the vast majority of responding programs have experienced at least some programmatic changes since receiving the Award, and only 13 percent of programs report no changes.

The most common change reported is the size of the programs. Many of these programs report expansions in size and scope. For example, the Florida Healthy Kids Program, a 1996 winner, expanded state-wide after winning the Award, and programs such as Parents as Teachers and the Trauma Intervention Programs, Inc., have become national programs. A small number report decreases in program size mainly due to decreases in funding or organizational restructuring.

Another source of change for Innovations winners is leadership turnover. Nearly 50 percent of programs report leadership changes. Considering the fact that only three respondents report programs that are no longer in operation, it is significant that recognized innovations, which often flourish through strong leadership, remain sustainable despite leadership changes.

The third area where a large number of programs report changes is in funding or funding sources. While some report funding cuts, others report increased funding or steady funding provided by a different department or sponsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM CHANGES (check all that apply)</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>12 13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Department or Agency</td>
<td>13 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>45 49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>51 56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Alliances</td>
<td>10 11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source/Sponsorship</td>
<td>22 24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Organizational Structure</td>
<td>16 17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>9 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes</td>
<td>12 13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15 16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognition

Among its chief goals, the Innovations in American Government Awards Program seeks to showcase examples of innovation in government and, in so doing, improve government’s public image and government’s practice through emulation. Thus, it was important to learn from respondents how they perceived the value of the Award in elevating their stature and expanding their reach. The vast majority (87 percent) of respondents reported that the recognition gained through the Innovations Award had some to substantial impact on their public profile and program success. Only four respondents (4.4 percent) indicated that the Award had no impact, eight respondents (8.8 percent) indicated that they were unsure, and 0 respondents indicated a negative impact from the Award.

Many respondents credited the substantial media attention resulting from the Award as beneficial to expansion efforts and lending credibility to their activities. For example, the 1988 winner Project Match reports that when the program won the Award, “all of the national recognition, particularly the national media (e.g. The New York Times) and the local media (e.g., The Chicago Tribune)” put the program “on the map.” A number of other programs, including the Medical Care for Children Program (1990 winner), the Community Voicemail Program (1993 winner), and the Center for Court Innovation (1998 winner), report that the Innovations in American Government Award was a “seal of approval,” that allowed these programs “to be taken seriously” and to be considered a “worthy endeavor.” According to the Seattle Climate Protection Initiative, a recent 2007 winner, it is “very helpful to have the kind of independent, third-party verification/affirmation of our program that the Award provides.”

For other programs, recognition provided internal leverage to draw greater agency attention and support on behalf of their activities. Such was the case for the 1999 winner City of Philadelphia’s Department of Behavioral Health/Mental Retardation Services, which reported that “the award was a key component in the process that led to the creation of a separate department in city government.” The Award has enabled others to attract outside funding such as 1998’s Smart Start, which was able to expand the program, and the School Based Youth Services Program, a 1991 winner from New Jersey, which reported that the Award caught the attention of foundations and other sponsors to allow them to undergo a formal evaluation. Another program that lost its state funding at the time of the Award was able to continue with a skeleton program, while the Award-related press coverage enabled program staff to seek new funding. Within a year, the program was back to its original size and in three years, they had established a broad public-private funding base.
Some programs have benefited from the attention of the Award in other ways. The 1996 winner Riverside County’s CalWORKs GAIN program reports that they “were visited by President George H. Bush, various governors, and public dignitaries within the United States, and representatives from China, New Zealand, Great Britain, Korea, and other countries.” Many programs report that the recognition encouraged other jurisdictions to visit their programs to learn more (as described in detail in the following section).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT OF HARVARD-FORD RECOGNITION</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to impact on prestige, replication, and enhanced leveragability, a high number of winning programs reported receiving other awards subsequent to their Innovations Award. It would be impossible from the survey data to measure the causality of the relationship between the Innovations and other awards, but the 63.7 percent (58 respondents) level of other awards won by respondents may imply validation through Innovations Awards.

**Replication**

**Overview**

The Innovations in American Government Awards Program was founded on the belief that innovative programs can have the greatest impact if they are adopted by others and spread across the United States and beyond. Replication, defined broadly for the purposes of this report, refers to the transference or adaptation of programs or components of programs to new agencies and jurisdictions. This issue of the diffusion of innovation and eventual replication, however, is inherently difficult to quantify. The questions are many, and include the following: At what point is another program a replication and not an adaptation? Can something that implements components be considered a replication? What if the replication is superficial rather than substantive? What if a replication fails or morphs into something entirely different? These questions point to a host of areas of inquiry relating to social and sys-
temp dynamics which, ultimately, are core to understanding innovations and its spread, but which are not within the purview of this survey. For this survey, we relied on the respondent's knowledge of whether his or her program had been replicated, where, and to what extent these replications implemented components of the original program. We also collected information on, in their view, what replications were successful and unsuccessful, and why.

**Extent of Replication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPLICATION</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONDENTS (91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPLICATION BY NUMBER OF SITES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESPONDENTS (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–250</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above charts indicate the survey respondents' views of whether or not replication of their program has occurred, and in how many separate locations. The most valuable aspect of the above charts is the overall assertion by program representatives' responses that over two-thirds (78 percent) of their programs have been “replicated” (wholesale or partially). In addition, as evidenced in the second Replication table, of those programs that have been replicated and could estimate the number of sites where replication has occurred, more than half of the respondents indicated that they had been replicated in over 10 separate jurisdictions. Also notably, 10 programs, representing 15 percent of respondents, reported that their programs had been replicated in over 100 sites.

As the table above demonstrates, perhaps even more significant than the number of programs that have been adopted is that 90.1 percent of those “replications” occurred with some (49.3 percent) to significant (40.8 percent) involvement from the original winning program’s staff. This last finding notes that leadership and willingness to engage others externally are key elements to transferability of innovations. The Innovations in American Government Awards Program requests that winning programs are amenable to such queries during their grant period, and it is gratifying to see that this diffusion has continued long after the Awards are given. In fact, 87 percent of 86 respondents indicated that their program staff continues to encourage the implementation of their program in other communities.

The types of reported activities carried out in this transfer process range from hosting visitors, building informational websites, and speaking at conferences, to extensive outreach travel by staff nation- and worldwide. Some programs have evolved from local implementers to national umbrella organizations on behalf of their innovation. Parents as Teachers, one of Innovations Awards’ earlier winners (1987), began in Missouri as a local initiative to train parents to be their children’s first teachers. It now boasts a “National Center” (PATNC) with “some 3,000 domestic Parents as Teachers programs today.” They exist within state departments of education and health, local school districts, nonprofit organizations, health settings, Head Start/Early Head Start programs, Native American reservations, and military installations. Internationally, programs operate through additional funding mechanisms.”

Other highly replicated programs have adopted prior innovations and then been replicated themselves. Baltimore’s Citistat program evolved from New York’s CompStat program, a 1996 Innovations Award winner that significantly reduced crime in New York City through its comprehensive management tool. CitiStat applied the principles of CompStat to improve city services and won the Award in 2004. Both programs have become established best practices and are widely replicated across the United States.
Many programs not only have spread across the United States, but also have been replicated around the world. In addition to the aforementioned PulseNet USA, New York’s Center for Court Innovation (a 1998 winner) has inspired over 200 courts in New York State, “three dozen replications of the model across the United States, and another three dozen developing internationally, including South Africa, England, Ireland, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Scotland,” among others.

**Extent of Replication, Successes, and Failures**

Of the numerous programs that have been adopted or replicated, the extent of the replication ranges from certain components to the entire program, with the majority reported as some combination of the two, depending on the case. A small percentage (4.3 percent) report that only superficial or symbolic components were replicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTIRETY OF REPLICATION</th>
<th>REPLICATED PROGRAMS (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole program</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Specific Components</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both, in different cases</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Superficial and/or Symbolic Components</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to provide their personal opinions on which replications of their programs were the most successful and unsuccessful. The majority of responses, although anecdotal, indicated that the replicating entities were generally successful, and that failures tended to occur when there was a lack of funding and ineffective leadership. Likewise, respondents credited the strong leadership and commitment of many of the adopters of their programs, and felt that this leadership was integral to the success of the replication.
Impact and Influence

Research and Academic Writing

A large percentage of respondents asserted that their programs have been the subject of research or academic writing, including books, journal articles, and evaluations. Many have partnered with local universities, which study and report on the programs, and students have focused their dissertations on some. There were a number of programs with an impressive presence in academic literature. For example, New York’s Center for Technology in Government, a 1995 winner, has been the subject of “approximately 30 academic and practitioner journal articles; 17 book chapters; 79 conference papers; 166 conference and other venue presentations, posters, and panels, including over $3 million in a NSF funded research project.” Many programs listed dozens of academic citations, and quite a few indicated that there were “too many to count.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMPTED RESEARCH OR ACADEMIC WRITING</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislation, New Funding, Policy, Issues Analysis

A high proportion, 73 respondents, claimed that their innovations prompted new legislation, program funding, or policy and issues analysis. Descriptions of the types of influence reported in these arenas varied, ranging from influencing national policy and federal laws to engendering local statutes. For the Groundwater Remediation Program and WATER Center from Wichita Kansas, a 1992 winner, the state law was changed to allow the program to continue to be funded in a new way, and policies of both the state and federal agencies were changed to allow the project to succeed. King County, Washington’s Metro Commute Partnerships, a 2000 winner, prompted a King County Transit Now 2006 ballot measure, Washington State’s Commute Trip Reduction Act 2006 renewal, federal legislation reauthorization, as well as local and national grants.
Many of the legislative changes prompted by programs have been enacted to ensure continuance of funding for the program in the future, though many have also resulted in securing additional funding for new programs. For example, the previously mentioned Department of Behavioral Health/Mental Retardation Services was able to fund new programs due to the savings that were realized through the success of the original program.

A number of programs have had an effect on intergovernmental cooperation and collaboration. The Resolve to Stop the Violence Program, a 2004 winner, has worked to change local policies, resulting in improved collaboration among law enforcement agencies. The success of Chicago’s 311 Program, a 2003 winner, has encouraged Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) between local municipalities, counties, and policy developments among individual departments that use the program’s data in their own work.

**Press Presence**

While the Innovations in American Government Awards Program strives to achieve national and local press coverage for all winning and finalist programs, and continues to bring attention to them through the Government Innovators Network, the survey was a useful tool to learn about our Award winners’ current press presence. Notably, 80 percent of respondents (68) indicated that their programs continue to be covered in the media. The table below illustrates the frequency of these press impressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMPTED CHANGES IN POLICY (check all that apply)</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Initiatives</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of New Programs</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Recommendations</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Analysis</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of these media appearances are in newspapers, but a significant percentage of respondents also indicate coverage on television, radio, the Internet, and in Internet weblogs.

The chart below indicates what prompts the above media appearances. From the data, it is clear that programs remain committed to using the press to further their recognition in the media. A majority continue to use press releases, while many hold public events. Nearly 40 percent continue to intentionally and strategically reach out to media representatives.
Role in the Community

The Ash Institute is interested in the impact that Award winning programs have within their local community, and how well these programs and their leadership are known locally, regionally, nationally, and beyond.

A large number of programs, 68.2 percent (58 respondents), indicated that their program is well known within their communities. A slightly higher number, 73.8 percent (62 respondents), indicated that program staff makes an effort to reach out to their community. Many of these outreach efforts began before programs won the Award and continue as an integral part of the programs. Examples include outreach at community meetings, school events, church gatherings, and civic organizations. A number of programs have a regional outreach strategy, and work with government agencies, nonprofits, and the private sector in their states and surrounding communities. Many use the local media to assist them with their outreach, like 1999 winner Cangleska, Inc., which uses a weekly radio show to keep in contact with the public.

An interesting finding of the survey is that when reporting how well-known their program is in various regions, a larger majority—75 respondents—indicated that their programs are nationally recognized (80 percent), locally (69.3 percent), or regionally (70.7 percent). A possible reason for this is that while some programs tend to be ‘behind the scenes’ in their own communities, these programs have become widely viewed as best practices in their fields, and as a result, are often highlighted at national conferences and in the national media. A small but still significant number of programs (24 respondents, or 30.7 percent) are known throughout the world as best practices and continue to be known in government circles around the globe.

Program leaders also enjoy some recognition within their field and beyond. As illustrated in the below table, a staggering 90 percent are considered leaders in their own field. This finding is not surprising, as strong leadership is a noted characteristic of many winning programs during the Innovations in American Government selection process. In fact, an ongoing debate in the Innovations Program is the importance of strong leadership in

### WHAT PROMPTS MEDIA COVERAGE (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Events</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Outreach to Media Representatives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Press Coverage</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting finding of the survey is that when reporting how well-known their program is in various regions, a larger majority—75 respondents—indicated that their programs are nationally recognized (80 percent), locally (69.3 percent), or regionally (70.7 percent). A possible reason for this is that while some programs tend to be ‘behind the scenes’ in their own communities, these programs have become widely viewed as best practices in their fields, and as a result, are often highlighted at national conferences and in the national media. A small but still significant number of programs (24 respondents, or 30.7 percent) are known throughout the world as best practices and continue to be known in government circles around the globe.

Program leaders also enjoy some recognition within their field and beyond. As illustrated in the below table, a staggering 90 percent are considered leaders in their own field. This finding is not surprising, as strong leadership is a noted characteristic of many winning programs during the Innovations in American Government selection process. In fact, an ongoing debate in the Innovations Program is the importance of strong leadership in...
the success and dissemination of the program. As mentioned earlier in this report, many programs have remained successful while undergoing transitions in leadership, which may not only speak to the strength of the programs as they are designed, but also that the programs continue to select strong candidates to represent them.

### Going Forward

The survey asked a series of open-ended questions regarding each program’s plans for the future, including long-term objectives and the expected challenges the programs expect to face.

Though a number of programs hope to sustain the program at its current level while continually improving efficiency and effectiveness, many other programs hope to expand the program within their own community and beyond. Some programs would like to apply their successful innovations to improve outcomes in other areas and departments. For example, North Carolina’s Overt Drug Market Strategy, a 2007 winner, seeks to use their drug reduction strategy to impact other criminal behaviors such as gangs and domestic violence across the country.

A number of programs have significant goals going forward. According to the 2000 winner Mental Hospital Seclusion and Restraint Reduction, “when we received the Award, our goal was seclusion and restraint reduction. Now our goal is elimination.” The Continuum of Care for Ending Homelessness, a 1987 winner from St. Louis, seeks to completely eliminate long-term homelessness from the city of St. Louis, while the 1996 winner Oregon Health Plan seeks to expand their program to ensure that all citizens receive health insurance. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s Grass Roots Conservation Program, a 2006 winner, plans to strengthen its commitment to protecting the natural resources and rural way of life in the Blackfoot Valley for present and future generations.

The survey respondents recognize that they will encounter challenges in the future as they seek to expand and advance the goals of their programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHERE PROGRAM STAFF ARE LEADERS (check all that apply)</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS (75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In their Field</td>
<td>68  90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Community</td>
<td>51  68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally</td>
<td>50  66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationally</td>
<td>14  18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3   4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not surprisingly, the overwhelming concern for almost every program is the continuation, lack, or limitation of funding, both to expand the program or simply to continue current programmatic activities. Some programs are continually fighting to ensure resources in an environment where securing funding is increasingly competitive. Several programs are undergoing staffing issues, such as turnover in leadership or finding and training highly qualified staff, while others are dependent upon legislative approval to continue. 2001’s OK-First program reports that continually readjusting for constant advances in technology is a concern.

Despite the challenges, the survey respondents appear confident that their programs will be able to continue, and indeed expand and continue replication activities in the future.
Conclusion

We can infer from survey responses that significant numbers of Innovations winners were impacted favorably by the Innovations in American Government Award and that many of their innovations or elements thereof were widely disseminated and adopted by other agencies and jurisdictions, locally, nationally, and even internationally. The most significant finding is that the majority of respondents who report some form of replication of their innovation also indicate that they themselves held an important role in that process. This in turn, underscores the importance of leadership and outreach in the dissemination of innovation. At this point in time, the survey also validates the relative longevity of Innovation Programs.

Finally, the 91 returned surveys provide a healthy amount of qualitative data. We hope this document will help inspire further investigation amongst researchers and students, and foster additional debate on the questions raised by this preliminary research and outreach effort.
Appendix

Survey Questions

Innovations in American Government 20th Anniversary Survey Questions

A. Contact Information and Program Status.
Please provide contact information so that we can include you in our mailings and, if requested, can provide correct information to the press and researchers. We would also like to know the current status of your program and how your program has changed, if at all, since receiving an Innovations Award.

1. Contact Information
Name: 
Title: 
Department: 
Address: 
Phone: 
Fax: 
Email: 
Web: 

2. Is your program still active?
[ ] Yes 
[ ] No 

If you answered “no,” please indicate termination date and describe in a few words the reason for termination. (One paragraph or less.)

3. Has your program changed its name since its award? (Please refer to the program name we listed at the beginning of the survey.)
[ ] Yes 
[ ] No 

If you answered “yes,” please indicate the new name and describe briefly the reasons and context (e.g. changes in administration, political climate, funding source, etc.) for the name change (one paragraph or less).

4. Has the program changed in any of the following other ways since being recognized by the Innovations Program? (Please indicate all that apply).
[ ] Geographic location 
[ ] Different department or agency 
[ ] Leadership
Please summarize briefly any changes indicated above.

5. Has your program received other awards or recognition?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If you answered “yes,” please list other awards or recognition your program has received; include year and sponsor.

6. Has recognition from Harvard University and the Ford Foundation had any impact on your public profile and program success?
[ ] Substantial
[ ] Some
[ ] None
[ ] Not sure
[ ] Negative impact

If you indicated “substantial,” “some,” or “negative” impact in the previous question, please provide details and cite specific examples. (One paragraph or less.)

B. Replication and/or dissemination of your program.
By recognizing innovative government programs such as yours, the Innovations Program hopes to encourage the replication of the innovation in other communities. We want to know to what extent other communities across the nation or the globe have successfully implemented your program or aspects of it.

7. Has your program been implemented elsewhere?
(If “yes,” please complete a-f; if “no,” skip to question 8).
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not sure
a) If you answered “yes”, please list, to the best of your knowledge, program name[s], institution[s], and location[s] where it has been implemented. (For each replication, please complete questions c-f).

b) Was the entire program implemented?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No, only specific components were implemented
[ ] Both, in different cases
[ ] Only superficial and/or symbolic components of the program were implemented

If you indicated implementation of components, please describe which components were implemented (one paragraph or less for each case).

c) Did your program have an active role in this replication?
[ ] Significant role
[ ] Some role
[ ] Possible, not sure
[ ] No role

If your program had a role, please describe (one paragraph or less).

d) Please indicate which of the above replications were, in your assessment, successful and why the replication succeeded. (One paragraph or less.)

e) Please indicate which of the above replications were, in your assessment, not successful and why the replication failed. (One paragraph or less.)

8. Do members of your program continue to encourage the implementation of your program by other communities?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, please describe your efforts.
C. Impact on public policy.
We would like to know to what extent, if at all, your program has influenced public policy within the U.S. or internationally.

9. Has your program prompted research or academic writing?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not sure

If you answered “yes,” please describe and provide citations (one paragraph or less).

10. Please indicate whether your program influenced or prompted any of the following events:
[ ] Legislative initiatives
[ ] Funding of new programs
[ ] Policy recommendations
[ ] Issues analysis

If you indicated any of the above events, please describe and provide titles or topics (one paragraph or less).

D. Your program’s current press presence.
We would like to know what sort of presence, if any, your program has in local, state, and national media.

11. Does your program continue to be reported in the media? (If “no,” skip to the next page)
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Not sure

12. If you answered “yes,” please indicate approximately how often your program appears in the media (please check the category which mostly closely applies).
[ ] Once or twice every 6 months to 1 year
[ ] Once or twice every 6 months
[ ] Once or twice every month
[ ] Once or twice every week
[ ] Daily or almost daily
13. In which media are your program reported? (Check all that apply and name specific media entities: NY Times, PBS, etc.)
[ ] Newspapers:
[ ] TV:
[ ] Radio:
[ ] News Magazines
[ ] Professional Journals/Trade Magazines:
[ ] Internet Newsgroups:
[ ] Internet Listservs (i.e., e-mail distribution lists):
[ ] Internet Website:
[ ] Internet blog or social networking site
[ ] Other, specify type:

14. What prompts the media reports on your program? (Please check all that apply.)
[ ] Press releases
[ ] Public events, please specify:
[ ] Explicit outreach to media representatives
[ ] Other press coverage
[ ] Other, please specify:

E. Role in the community.
We are interested in knowing to what extent your program is recognized within the community it serves and beyond.

15. Are members of your program recognized as leaders (check all that apply)?
[ ] In their field
[ ] In the community
[ ] Nationally
[ ] Internationally
[ ] Other:

Please give examples of this leadership (one paragraph or less).
F. Going Forward.
We are interested in the future goals and objectives of your program.

16. What are the long-term (five years or more) objectives of your program? (One paragraph or a short list.). Please indicate whether your program is meeting, or has met, these objectives and also indicate how you measure progress towards fulfilling these objectives (one paragraph or less)?

17. What are the future challenges your program expects to face?

18. Please tell us something interesting or unusual about your program not covered in previous questions.

19. Please provide recommendations for how the Innovations in American Government Awards Program might assist you with your program in the future.

20. Please use this space for any additional comments.
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Living at Home/Block Nurse Programs
(formerly Block Nurse Program)
Elderberry Institute
475 Cleveland Avenue North, Suite 322
Street Paul, MN  55104-5051
Phone: 651-649-0315
Fax: 651-649-0318
elderb@elderberry.org
www.elderberry.org

Case Management for At-Risk Children in Detention
New York City Department of Juvenile Justice
110 William Street, 13th floor
New York, NY  10038
Phone: 2124427287
Fax: Unavailable

Family Learning Center*
The Family Learning Center
400 Kimball Street
Leslie, MI  49251
Phone: 517-589-9102
Fax: Unavailable

Food Assistance Network*
Department of Community and Senior Citizen Services
Los Angeles County
3175 W. 6th Street, 3rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA  90020
Phone: 214-738-2617
Fax: Unavailable

Groundwater Management Code*
Internet Systems Manager
Arizona Department of Water Resources
3550 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ  85012
Phone: 602-771-8500
Fax: 602-417-2401

* These programs are no longer operational.
Illinois One Family One Child
(formerly One Church/One Child Minority Adoption Campaign)
R.O. Box 0974
Chicago, IL  60690
Phone:  312-566-0300
Fax:  312-566-0175
http://onefamilyonechild.org/index.html

Quality Incentive Program*
Bureau of Long Term Care
Department of Public Aid
1062 South Saddle Ridge Court
Palatine, IL  60067-9116
Phone:  847-675-7979
Fax:  847-675-0555

Rehabilitation Engineering Program
Operations and Support Services
North Carolina Division of Vocational and
Rehabilitation Services
2801 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC  27699-2801
Phone:  919-855-3556
Fax:  919-733-7968
www.dhhs.state.nc.us/docs/divinfo/dvr.htm

Strive Toward Excellence in Performance*
Enterprise Management, International
2308 West Lake of the Isles
Minneapolis, MN  55405
Phone:  612-377-3878
Fax:  612-337-7806

Video Disc Catalog*
City Bureau of Assessment
City Hall, Room 101-A
30 Church Street
Rochester, NY  14614
Phone:  716-428-7221
Fax:  716-428-6038
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Alternatives to Incarceration*
Probation Division Services
Georgia Department of Corrections
East Tower, Suite 954
2 Martin Luther King, Jr., Drive SE
Atlanta, GA  30334
Phone:  404-651-4747
Fax:  404-651-6537

Domestic Abuse Intervention Project
(formerly Minnesota Program Development, Inc.)
Duluth Police Department
411 West 1st Street
City Hall, Room 104-A
Duluth, MN  55802
Phone:  218-722-2781
Fax:  218-723-3364
www.dareduluth.org

City of St. Louis Continuum of Care for Ending Homelessness
(formerly Homeless Services Network)
Homeless Services Program
St. Louis Department of Human Services
634 North Grand, Suite 720
Street Louis, MO  63103
Phone:  314-612-5906
Fax:  314-612-5959
www.stlouiscity.com

Nova Ancora
New York City Department of Probation
33 Beaver Street
New York, NY  10004
Phone:  212-232-0761
Fax:  212-232-0686
www.nyc.gov/html/prob/
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OPEN/NET – The Open Public Events Network
Agency for Public Telecommunication
North Carolina Administration Department
116 West Jones Street, G-102
1316 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699
Phone: 919-733-6341
Fax: 919-715-3569
open@ncmail.net
www.ncapt.tv

Parents as Teachers
Parents as Teachers National Center
2228 Ball Drive
St. Louis, MO 63146
Phone: 314-432-4330
Fax: 3144328963
info@patnc.org
www.parentsasteachers.org

Parents Too Soon
1112 South Wabash
Chicago, IL 60605
Phone: 312-793-7957
Fax: Unavailable
dhshpad@dhs.state.il.us
www.dhs.state.il.us

Vision Through Diversity*
Dallas Park and Recreation Department
1500 Marilla Drive
Dallas, TX 75224
Phone: 214-670-4100
Fax: Unavailable

Water Pollution Control Program
Department of Environmental Management
5000 Martin Luther King Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76119-4166
Phone: 817-871-465
Fax: 817-871-5464
www.fortworthgov.org/dem
Wetland Wastewater Treatment
Environmental Services Department
City of Arcata
736 F Street
Arcata, CA 95521
Phone: 707-822-8184
Fax: 707-822-8018
eservices@arcatacityhall.org
www.arcatacityhall.org/
Celebrating 20 Years of Government Innovation
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**Computer Assisted Report Entry**
South County Precinct
St. Louis County Police Department
7900 Forsyth Boulevard
Clayton, MO 63105
Phone: 314-615-7860
Fax: 314-889-3604
www.co.st-louis.mo.us/police/station.html

**Industry Action Project***
Business Work and Learning Corporation
Schrafft Center
529 Main Street
Boston, MA 02129
Phone: 617-727-8158
Fax: 617-242-7660

**Kentucky Video Courts**
Administrative Office of the Courts
Commonwealth of Kentucky
100 Mill Creek Park
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502-573-2350
Fax: 502-695-1759
www.kycourts.net/AOC/Facilities/AOC_Video_courtrooms.shtm

**Land Development Guidance System***
City of Fort Collins
300 LaPorte Avenue (ZIP 80521)
P.O. Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522
Phone: 970-221-6376
Fax: 970-224-6111
Parent and Child Education Program
Department for Adult Education and Literacy
Workforce Development Cabinet
Capitol Plaza Tower, 3rd Floor
500 Mero Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502-564-5114
Fax: Unavailable
www.kyae.ky.gov/

Project Match
420 North Wabash Avenue, 6th Floor
Chicago, IL 60611
Phone: 312-893-7241
Fax: 312-755-0928
www.financeprojectinfo.org/WIN/promising/projectmatch.htm

Public/Private Partnerships in Education
City of Tupelo Schools
P.O. Box 557
Tupelo, MS 38802
Phone: 662-841-8859
Fax: 662-841-8850
www.schoolsk-12.com/Mississippi/Tupelo/index.html

Racial Integration Incentives*
Realty One
20515 Shaker Boulevard
Shaker Heights, OH 44104
Phone: 2164911330
Fax: 2169919640

Single Room Occupancy Residential Hotel Program
San Diego Strategic Planning and Research Department
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 660B
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: 6192355219
Fax: Unavailable
sdhcinfo@sdhc.org
www.sdhc.net
Statewide Library Automation Project
Commissioner
Vermont Department of Libraries
State Office Building Post Office
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609-0601
Phone: 802-828-3265
Fax: 802-828-2199
www.lib.vt.us/dol/dol.htm
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Electronic Benefit Transfer
(formerly Electronic Benefit System)
Community Human Services Department
Ramsey County
160 East Kellogg Blvd
St. Paul, MN  55101-1494
Phone:  651-266-3760
Fax:  651-266-4438
www.dhs.state.mn.us

Farm Family Assistance Program*
753 19th Street
Des Moines, IA  50314
Phone:  515-282-6613
Fax:  Unavailable

Inupiat Ilitquiat: Traditional Values
Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope
KSCCC
P.O. Box 1073
Kotzebue, AK  99752
Phone:  907-442-7913
Fax:  907-852-4246
www.maniilaq.org

Landfill Reclamation Project
Solid Waste Management Department
Collier County Government
3301 Tamiami Trail East, Building H, 3rd Floor
Naples, FL  34112
Phone:  239-252-5337
Fax:  941-774-9222
www.colliercountyrecycles.com

Medical Care for Children
Fairfax County Office of Public Affairs
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 432
Fairfax, VA  22035-0065
Phone:  703-324-5171
Fax:  703-324-2010
www.mccponline.org
Project Deliver: Assuring Quality Obstetrical Care
Public Health Service
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 4200
Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-1568
Fax: 240-777-1860
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/hhstmpl.asp?url=/content/hhs/phs/index.asp

Community Services Division
(formerly Seattle Recycling Program)
Seattle Public Utilities
700 5th Avenue, Suite 4900
P.O. box 34018
Seattle, WA 98124-0418
Phone: 206-684-7934
Fax: 2066848529
www.seattle.gov/util/services

Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation Services*
Merced County Department of Mental Health
480 East 13th Street
Merced, CA 95340
Phone: 209-381-6800
Fax: Unavailable

The Work Force Youth Development Program
(formerly Work Force Unemployment Prevention Program)
Cambridge Housing Authority
675 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: 617-864-3020
Fax: 617-868-5372
www.cambridge-housing.org/chaweb.nsf

XPORT, The Port Authority Trading Company*
Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
1 World Trade Center, 62W
New York, NY 10048
Phone: 212-435-6550
Fax: Unavailable
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Friends of the Family
Friends of the Family, Inc.
1001 Eastern Avenue, 2nd Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: 410-659-7701
Fax: 410-783-0814
info@friendsofthefamily.org
www.friendsofthefamily.org

Georgia No-Tillage Assistance Program*
Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority
100 Peachtree Street NW, Suite 2090
Atlanta, GA  30303
Phone:  404-656-0938
Fax:  404-656-6416

KET Star Channels*
Kentucky Educational Television
600 Cooper Drive
Lexington, KY  40502-2296
Phone:  859-258-7000
Fax:  859-258-7399

K-SIX Early Intervention Partnership
Social Work Services Division
Fresno County Department of Social Services
1404 L Street
Fresno, CA  93721
Phone:  559-453-6678
Fax:  209-488-1888
www.fresnohumanservices.org/childrenandfamilyservices/EarlyInterventionPrevention/K-SixProgram.htm

Monroe Maternity Center, Inc.
Monroe Maternity Center, Inc.
Women’s Wellness & Maternity Center
P.O. Box 115
New Highway 68
Madisonville, TN  37354
Phone:  423-442-6624
Fax:  423-442-5746
www.wellnessandmaternity.com
Neighborhood Matching Fund
Seattle Department of Neighborhoods
700 Fifth Ave, Suite 1700
Seattle, WA  98124-4689
Phone:  206-684-0142
Fax:  206-233-5142
www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/nmf/

Philadelphia Anti-Graffiti Network, Inc.
1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Room 930
Philadelphia, PA  19102
Phone:  215-686-2114
Fax:  215-686-1458
www.phila.gov/administration/antigraffiti/antigraffiti.html

School Based Youth Services Program
Department of Children and Families
50 East State Street 5th floor
P.O. Box 717
Trenton, NJ  08625-0717
Phone:  6099845632
Fax:  6092921306
www.state.nj.us/dcf/

The Blackstone Project
Department of Environmental Protection
Environmental Executive Affairs Office
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
627 Main Street
Worcester, MA  1608
Phone:  508-767-2775
Fax:  617-574-6880
brcoalition@yahoo.com
www.zaptheblackstone.org

Trauma Intervention Programs, Inc.
(formerly Trauma Intervention Program)
Trauma Intervention Programs, Inc.
1420 Phillips Street
Vista, CA  92083
Phone:  714-314-0744
Fax:  619-929-0243
www.tipnational.org/
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Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control
Los Angeles Department of Transportation
100 South Main Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA  90012
Phone:  213-972-5050
Fax:  213-580-5580
www.lacity.org

Community Outreach Program
(formerly Bilingual Outreach)
Arlington County Department of Human Services
3033 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 300B
Arlington, VA  22201
Phone:  703-228-1317
Fax:  703-228-1350
www.arlingtonva.us/departments/HumanServices/HumanServicesMain.aspx

Child Assistance Program
Division of Temporary Assistance
New York State Department of Social Services
40 North Pearl Street, 11th Floor
Albany, NY  12243
Phone:  518-474-9101
Fax:  518-474-9347
No website available

CityWorks*
Rindge School of Technical Arts
459 Broadway
Cambridge, MA  02138
Phone:  617-349-6752
Fax:  617-349-6770

Elder Services
(formerly Elderly Services)
Aging and Long Term Care of Eastern Washington
5125 North Market
Spokane, WA  99217
Phone:  509-458-7450
Fax:  509-458-2003
www.altcew.org/
Gilbert and Mosely Groundwater Remediation Program and WATER Center
(formerly Environmental Cleanup Program)
Office of the City Manager
1900 East 9th Street
Wichita, KS  97214
Phone:  316-268-8351
Fax:  316-268-4519
www.wichita.gov

Fleet Improvement R&D Network
New York City Department of Sanitation
52-35 58th Street, Room 612
Woodside, NY  11377
Phone:  718-334-9298
Fax:  718-334-9303

Humanitas
Urban Education Partnership
(formerly Los Angeles Educational Partnership)
315 West 9th Street, #1110
Los Angeles, CA  90015-4211
Phone:  213-622-5237
Fax:  213-629-5288
www.urbanedpartnership.org

Quincy Court Model Domestic Abuse Program
Quincy District Court
1 Dennis F. Ryan Parkway
Quincy, MA  02169
Phone:  617-471-1650
Fax:  617-376-4785
www.mass.gov/courts/courtsandjudges/courts/quincydistrictmain.html

Washington State Workers’ Compensation
Insurance Services Division
Washington Department of Labor and Industries
P.O. Box 44100
Olympia, WA  98504-4100
Phone:  360-902-4209
Fax:  360-902-4940
www.lni.wa.gov
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Central Park East High School
New York City High School Division
1573 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10029
Phone: 212-831-1517
Fax: 212-876-3494
No website available

Child Care Management Services
Childcare Services
Texas Workforce Commission
101 East 15st Street, Room 440T
Austin, TX 78778-0001
Phone: 512-936-3160
Fax: 512-463-5067
www.ruralcapitalworkforce.com/Main/Child%20Care/Child%20Care.htm

Community Voice Mail
(formerly Community Voice Mail for Phoneless/Homeless Persons)
Community Voice Mail Project
Community Technology Institute
2901 3rd Avenue, Suite 100
Seattle, WA 98121
Phone: 206-441-7872
Fax: 206-441-4784
www.cvm.org/whatcvm/seattle.htm

County of Los Angeles Telecommuting Program
Director of Marketing
Chief Administrative Offices, Los Angeles County
500 West Temple Street, Room B-1
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: 213-974-2495
Fax: 213-680-2450
No website available

Government Action On Urban Land
Tax Department, Cuyahoga County
County Administration Bldg
1219 Ontario Street
Cleveland, OH 44113
Phone: 216-443-5872
Fax: 216-443-7444
www.cuyahoga.oh.us
Info/California*
Health & Welfare Agency Data Center
1651 Alhambra Blvd
Sacramento, CA  95816
Phone:  916-739-7700
Fax:  916-451-0780

Computer Learning Centers
Lansing Housing Commission
310 Seymour Avenue
Lansing, MI  48933
Phone:  517-487-6550
Fax:  517-487-6877
www.lanshc.org

Low-Income Assisted Mortgage Program
Loan Origination and Development Division
Loan Servicing and Origination
814 Virginia Street East
Charleston, WV  25301
Phone:  304-345-6475
Fax:  304-340-9941
No website available

Police Homeowner Loan Program
Community Development Department
1136 Washington Street
[P.O. Box 147, Zip 29217]
Columbia, SC  29217
Phone:  803-545-3369
Fax:  803-988-8014
comdev@columbiasc.net

Oregon Procurement Information Network
(formerly Vendor Information Program)
Purchasing Section
Oregon Department of Administrative Services
1225 Ferry Street, SE
Salem, OR  97310
Phone:  503-378-4651
Fax:  503-373-1626
www.oregon.gov/DAS/PFSS/SPO/index.shtml
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“Here, Thayer, and Everywhere”*
Thayer School
85 Parker Street
Winchester, NH 03470
Phone: 603-239-4381
Fax: 603-239-4968

“QuickCourt” System*
Adult Probation Services Division
Administrative Office of the Courts
Arizona Supreme Court
1501 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3327
Phone: 602-542-9464
Fax: 602-542-9480

Citywide Central Insurance Program
Citywide Central Insurance Program
New York City Mayor’s Office of Operations
220 Church Street, Room 321
New York, NY 10013
Phone: 212-788-4906
Fax: 212-274-6198

Coles Levee Ecosystem Preserve
Habitat Conservation Division
California Department of Fish and Game
1416 9th Street, Room 1260
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: 916-653-4875
Fax: 916-653-2588
www.aeraenergy.com/whoweare/ColesLevee.htm

Minnesota Parents’ Fair Share*
Minnesota Parents' Fair Share
Anoka County Job Training Center
1201 89th Avenue NE, Suite 235
Blaine, MN 55434
Phone: 612-783-4826
Fax: 612-783-4844
Oregon Progress Board
(formerly Oregon Benchmarks)
Oregon Progress Board
155 Cottage Street, NE
Salem, OR  97301
Phone:  503-378-3202
Fax:  503-581-5115
www.oregon.gov/DAS/OPB

Partnership for Long-Term Care
Health & Long Term Care Division
New York State Department of Social Services
1 Commerce Plaza, Suite 826
Albany, NY  12210
Phone:  518-474-0662
Fax:  518-473-4232
pltc@health.state.ny.us
www.nyspltc.org

Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners Program
Tulsa Police Department
600 Civic Center
Tulsa, OK  74103
Phone:  918-596-7608
Fax:  918-596-9330
www.tulsapolice.org/

Student Conflict Resolution Experts
Consumer Protection/Antitrust Division
Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA  02108
Phone:  617-727-2200
Fax:  617-727-5765
www.ago.state.ma.us

Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup
Superfund and Emergency Response
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
520 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, MN  55155-4194
Phone:  651-297-8564
Fax:  612-296-8717
www.mda.state.mn.us/chemicals/spills/incidentresponse/gd05.htm
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Center for Technology in Government
Center for Technology in Government
University at Albany, State University of New York
187 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12205
Phone: 518-442-3766
Fax: 518-442-3886
www.ctg.albany.edu

CityWork*
Office of the Mayor, City of Louisville
601 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202
Phone: 502-458-6813
Fax: 502-574-4201

Competition and Costing*
Innovations in American Government
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
79 JFK Street, T354
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: 617-495-0557
Fax: 617-496-4602

Early Warning Program*
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
1200 K Street NW, Suite 210
Washington, DC 20005-4026
Phone: 202-326-4010
Fax: 202-326-4016

Elder CHOICE
Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
1 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108
Phone: 617-854-1360
Fax: 617-854-1091
www.masshousing.com
GENESIS: Healthy Young Families
Community Health
Boulder County Health Department
3450 Broadway
Longmont, CO  80501
Phone:  303-678-6168
Fax:  303-678-6125
www.co.boulder.co.us/health/commhlth/genesis/

Hamilton Terrace Learning Center
Caddo Parish School Board
1105 Lousiana Avenue
Shreveport, LA  71101
Phone:  318-424-3150
Fax:  318-424-7864
No website available

Hillsborough HealthCare
(aka Hillsborough Health Care Program)
(formerly Hillsborough County Health Care Plan)
County Administrator’s Office
Hillsborough County Center
P.O. Box 1110-601
601 East Kennedy Blvd
Tampa, FL 33602
Phone:  813-276-2843
Fax:  813-247-8246
www.hillsboroughcounty.org

Maine Top 200 Experimental Targeting Program*
Occupational Safety and Health Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room S-2315
Washington, DC  20210
Phone:  2026932126
Fax:  Unavailable

National Defense on the Offense
Strategic Development Branch
U.S. Department of Defense
Defense Supply Center Philadelphia
700 Robbins Avenue
Philadelphia, PA  19111-5092
Phone:  215-737-3001
Fax:  Unavailable
Operation Jobs
U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
8101 North Stemmons Freeway
Dallas, TX  75247
Phone: 214-905-5899
Fax: 214-655-3040
www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis

Ozone Depleting Chemical Elimination*
801 Irving-Wick Drive West
MC NB-05
Heath, OH  43056-6117
Phone: 740-788-4331
Fax: Unavailable

Project QUEST
Project QUEST, Inc.
301 South Frio, Suite 400
San Antonio, TX  78207
Phone: 210-270-4690
Fax: 210-270-4691
www.questsa.com

Reinvention of the Bureau of Reclamation
Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW, Room 7652
Washington, DC  20240
Phone: 202-513-0574
Fax: 202-513-0114
www.usbr.gov

The Civil Enforcement Initiative
NYC Police Department
1 Police Plaza, Room 1406A
New York, NY  10038
Phone: 646-610-5336
Fax: 212-374-0284
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Arts Incubator
Arlington County Division of Cultural Affairs
3700 South Four Mile Run Drive
Arlington, VA  22206
Phone:  703-228-1840
Fax:  Unavailable
www.arlingtonarts.org/arts_incubator/default.htm

Compstat: A Crime Reduction Management Tool
New York City Police Department
1 Police Plaza, Suite 1300
New York, NY  10038
Phone:  646-610-8636
Fax:  212-374-0711

Consequence Assessment Tool Set and Operations Concept
Information Technology Services
Federal Emergency Management Agency Federal
500 C Street SW, Center Plaza, Room 226
Washington, DC  20472
Phone:  202-646-3349
Fax:  202-646-4652
www.fema.gov/

Consolidated Plan Now
(formerly Consolidated Planning/Community Connections)
Office of the Chief Information Officer
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street SW
Washington, DC  20410
Phone:  202-708-1817
Fax:  Unavailable
www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/conplan/index.cfm

Environmental Technology Certification
Environmental Technology
California Environmental Protection Agency
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA  95814
Phone:  916-322-0504
Fax:  916-324-0908
www.calepa.ca.gov/calcert/
Florida Healthy Kids Program
Florida Healthy Kids Corporation
661 East Jefferson Street, 2nd Floor
Tallahassee, FL 32311
Phone: 850-224-5437
Fax: 850-224-0615
www.healthykids.org

Riverside County CalWORKs GAIN
(formerly Greater Avenues for Independence)
CalWorks/GAIN & Child Care
Riverside County Department of Social Services
4060 County Circle Drive
Riverside, CA 92503
Phone: 951-358-3011
Fax: 909-358-3036
www.riverside-gain.org

No Sweat: Eradicating Sweatshops*
Wage and Hour Division
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room S-3502
Washington, DC 20210
Phone: 202-693-0051
Fax: 202-219-4753

Oregon Health Plan
Office of Oregon Health Plan Policy & Research
Public Service Building, 5th Floor
255 Capitol Street, NE
Salem, OR 97310
Phone: 503-378-2422
Fax: 503-378-5511
www.dhs.state.or.us/healthplan

Santa Fe Affordable Housing Roundtable
Community Services Department
125 Lincoln Avenue
[P.O. Box 909 ZIP: 87504-0909]
Santa Fe, NM 87501
Phone: 505-955-6603
Fax: 505-955-6671
www.santafenm.gov/community-services/community-development/Affordable-Housing/index.asp
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ConnectCare
Division of Medical Services
Arkansas Department of Human Services
Donaghey Plaza South
700 Main Street
Little Rock, AR  72201-4608
Phone:  501-682-8740
Fax:  501-682-1197
www.arkansas.gov/dhs/homepage.html

Gallery 37
Center for the Arts
66 East Randolph Street
Chicago, IL  60601
Phone:  312-742-1637
Fax:  312-744-9249
info@gallery37.org
www.gallery37.org

Land Recycling Program
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Rachel Carson State Office Building, 16th Floor
400 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA  17101-2301
Phone:  717-783-1566
Fax:  717-705-4980
www.dep.state.pa.us

Operation Cease Fire
Office of Strategic Planning and Resource Development
Boston Police Department
1 Schroeder Plaza
Boston, MA  02120
Phone:  617-343-5096
Fax:  617-343-5073
www.cityofboston.gov/police/
Pathways to Teaching Careers Program*
Pathways to Teaching Program
College of Education
Armstrong Atlantic State University
11935 Abercorn Street
Savannah, GA 31419
Phone: 912-921-2342
Fax: 912-921-5543

Reform of the U.S. Drug Approval Process
Associate Commissioner for Policy Coordination
Office of Policy
Food and Drug Administration
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
5600 Fishers Le., Room 14-101
Rockville, MD 20857
Phone: 301-827-3360
Fax: 301-594-6777
www.fda.gov/cder/index.html

Recreating Public Education for Results
Kentucky Department of Education
500 Mero Street, 19th Floor
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502-564-2000
Fax: 502-564-6470
www.kentuckyschools.org

Structured Sentencing
North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission
901 Corporate Center Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607
Phone: 919-890-1470
Fax: 919-733-2991
www.nccourts.org

TeleFile*
Marketing Analysis & Taxpayer Information Communications, Internal Revenue Service
U.S. Department of the Treasury
1111 Constitution Avenue NW, Room 7017
Washington, DC 20224
Phone: 202-622-1569
Fax: Unavailable
Georgia’s Pre-K Program
(formerly Voluntary Prekindergarten Program)
Office of School Readiness
10 Park Place South, Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30303
Phone: 404-656-0377
Fax: 404-651-7429
www.decal.state.ga.us
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Best Manufacturing Practices Program
Office of Naval Research, Department of the Navy
4321 Hartwick Road, Suite 400
College Park, MD 20740
Phone: 301-405-9990
Fax: Unavailable
www.bmpcoe.org/

BCMS Project Access
Buncombe County Medical Society
304 Summit Street
Asheville, NC 28803
Phone: 828-274-2267
Fax: 828-232-4179
www.bcmsonline.org/main/pp/

Center for Court Innovation
Center for Court Innovation
520 8th Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10018
Phone: 212-397-3050
Fax: 212-397-0985
www.courtnnovation.org/

Edwin Gould Academy: Unified Approach to Foster Care
Edwin Gould Academy
675 Chestnut Ridge Road
Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977-6222
Phone: 845-573-5920
Fax: 845-573-5697
www.edwingouldacademy.org

First Offender Prostitution Program
850 Bryant Street, 3rd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94114
Phone: 415-553-9723
Fax: 415-553-1737
www.sageprojectinc.org/prog-fopp.html
Fast-Track Product Recall Program
Senior Advisor to the Chairman
Office of the Chairman
U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
4330 East West Highway, Room 724
Bethesda, MD 20814
Phone: 301-504-0213
Fax: Unavailable

Northern New Mexico Collaborative Stewardship
Camino Real Ranger District
P.O. Box 68
15160 State Highway 75
Penasco, NM 87553
Phone: 575-587-2255
Fax: 575-758-6236

Puente Project
Student Academic Services
University of California
300 Lakeside Drive, 7th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
Phone: 510-987-0860
Fax: 510-834-0737
www.puente.net

Reparative Probation
Department of Corrections
103 South Main Street
Waterbury, VT 05671-1001
Phone: 802-241-2307
Fax: 802-241-2565
http://public.doc.state.vt.us/

Smart Start
Department of Health and Human Services
1100 Wake Forest Road, Adams Building
Raleigh, NC 27604
Phone: 919-821-7999
Fax: 919-715-4645
www.ncsmartstart.org
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City of Philadelphia Department of Behavioral Health/Mental Retardation Services
(formerly Behavioral Health System)
City of Philadelphia
1101 Market Street, 7th Floor
Philadelphia, PA  19107
Phone:  215-685-4732
Fax:  215-686-3494
No website available

Cangleska, Inc.
Shelter/Administration
Cangleska, Inc.
1 Cangleska Road
Kyle, SD  57752
Phone:  605-455-2244
Fax:  605-455-1245
www.cangleska.org/

Continuum of Care
Special Needs Assistance Program
Office of Community Planning and Development
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 Seventh Street SW, Room 7262
Washington, DC  20410
Phone:  202-402-4997
Fax:  202-401-0053
www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/programs/

Electronic Bond Bidding Initiative
Finance Department
City of Pittsburgh
City-County Building, Room 200
414 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA  15219
Phone:  412-255-2954
Fax:  412-255-2438
www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/finance/
Neighborhood Entrepreneurs Program
Neighborhood Entrepreneurs Program
City of New York
100 Gold Street, Room 7M-3
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-863-7347
Fax: 212-863-7439

PulseNet USA
(formerly PulseNet)
Diarrheal Diseases Branch
National Center for Infectious Diseases
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
1600 Clifton Road, Mail Stop C03
Atlanta, GA 30333
Phone: 404-639-3322
Fax: 404-639-3333
www.cdc.gov/pulsenet/

Rehabilitation Subcode
Division of Codes and Standards
New Jersey Department of Community Affairs
101 South Broad Street
P.O. Box 802
Trenton, NJ 08625
Phone: 609-292-7899
Fax: 609-633-6729
www.state.nj.us/dca/codes/rehab

Texas School Performance Review
Texas School Performance Review
Comptroller of Public Accounts
1501 North Congress
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: 512-475-0213
Fax: 512-475-1915
www.lbb.state.tx.us/TSPRP/Documents.htm
Toxics Use Reduction Program
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
100 Cambridge Street, 20th Floor
Boston, MA 2202
Phone: 617-292-5632
Fax: 617-626-1181
www.mass.gov/dep/

Wisconsin Works
Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development
201 East Washington Avenue
Madison, WI 53707-7935
Phone: 608-267-9692
Fax: 608-266-1784
www.dwd.state.wi.us
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**Brownfields Economic Redevelopment Initiative**  
Brownfields Project  
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, MC 05105  
Washington, DC  20460  
Phone: 202-566-2731  
Fax: 202-260-6606  
www.epa.gov/brownfields/

**Charter School Law**  
Minnesota Senate/House  
381 State Office Building  
100 Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Street Paul, MN  55155  
Phone: 651-296-5387  
Fax: 651-296-5071  
No website available

**HOPE VI Mixed-Finance Public Housing**  
Office of Public Housing Investments  
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
451 Seventh Street SW, Room 4130  
Washington, DC  20410  
Phone: 202-401-8812  
Fax: 202-401-2370  

**Mental Hospital Seclusion and Restraint Reduction**  
Bureau of Hospital Operations  
Pennsylvania Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services  
Administration Building DGS Annex Complex  
PO Box 2675  
Harrisburg, PA  17105  
Phone: 610-313-5974  
Fax: 610-313-1065  
www.dpw.state.pa.us/ServicesPrograms/MentalHealthSubstanceAbuse/
Metro Commute Partnerships
Market Development Group
King County Metro Transit
400 Yesler Way, YES-TR-0600
Seattle, WA 98104-2615
Phone: 206-263-3598
Fax: 206-684-2058
http://transit.metrokc.gov/Partnerships for Parks

Partnership for Parks
New York City Department of Parks & Recreation
The Arsenal, Central Park
830 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10021
Phone: 212-360-1310
Fax: 212-360-1350
www.partnershipsforparks.org/

Performance Based Contracting
Illinois Department of Children and Family Services
1026 South Damen Avenue
Chicago, IL 60612
Phone: 312-793-2030
Fax: 312-814-3255
www.state.il.us/dcfs/index.shtml

Perritech
Perry High School, Perry Public Schools
4326 Manchester Avenue
Perry, OH 44081
Phone: 440-259-9300
Fax: 440-259-9290
www.perry.k12.mi.us/

Public Health Model for Corrections
(aka Hampton County Community Integrated Correctional Health Program)
Health Services
Hampden County Sheriff’s Department
627 Randall Road
Ludlow, MA 01056
Phone: 413-547-8000
Fax: 413-589-0912
www.mphaweb.org/hccc_explore_overview.html
Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation
Office of the Governor, Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, Suite 1101
Baltimore, MD  21201
Phone:  410-767-4580
Fax:  410-260-8111
www.smartgrowth.state.md.us
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**Ho-Chunk, Inc.**
Ho-Chunk, Inc.
1 Mission Drive
Winnebago, NE 68071
Phone: 402-878-2809
Fax: 402-878-2560
www.hochunkinc.com

**Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement**
University of California Office of the President
300 Lakeside Drive, 7th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
Phone: 510-987-9138
Fax: 510-763-4704
www.mesa.ucop.edu/home.html

**National Center for Patient Safety**
Department of Veterans Affairs
24 Frank Lloyd Wright Drive, Lobby M
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-0486
Phone: 734-930-5890
Fax: 734-930-5877
www.patientsafety.gov

**OK-First**
(formerly OK-FIRST)
University of Oklahoma
120 David L Bourne Boulevard, Suite 2900
Norman, OK 73072
Phone: 405-325-2541
Fax: 405-325-2550
okfirst@mesonet.org
http://okfirst.ocs.ou.edu/

**Toledo Plan**
Toledo Public Schools
420 East Manhattan Boulevard
Toledo, OH 43608
Phone: 419-671-8362
Fax: 419-729-8436
www.tps.org
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Center for Higher Education
Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education
c/o Shawnee State University
940 Second Street
Portsmouth, OH 45662-4344
Phone: 740-351-3289
Fax: 740-351-3186
www.oache.org/

Chicago's 311 System
311 City Services
2111 West Lexington
Chicago, IL 60612
Phone: 312-746-9760
Fax: 312-744-4149
www.cityofchicago.org

Energy Efficiency Utility
Vermont Public Service Board
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701
Phone: 802-828-2358
Fax: 802-828-3351
www.efficiencyvermont.com

FirstGov.gov
General Services Administration Office of
Citizen Services and Communications
1800 F Street NW
Washington, DC 20405
Phone: 202-219-1081
Fax: 202-501-1300
www.firstgov.gov

La Bodega de la Familia
Family Justice, Inc.
625 Broadway 8th Floor
New York, NY 10012
Phone: 212-475-1500
Fax: 212-982-1765
www.familyjusticeinc.org/bodega/glance.html
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A Regional Coalition for Housing
Family Resource Center Campus Suite A-3
16225 NE 87th Street
Redmond, WA  98052
Phone: 425-861-3677
Fax: 425-861-4553
www.archhousing.org/

CitiStat
Office of the Mayor/Office of CitiStat Operations
100 Norder Holliday Street, City Hall Room 606 Baltimore, MD 21202
Phone: 410-396-4721
Fax: 410-625-8707
citistat1@baltimorecity.gov

ClinicalTrials.gov
National Library of Medicine
8600 Rockville Pike, Room 2W-12
Bethesda, MD 20894
Phone: 301-496-6308
Fax: 301-496-4450
www.clinicaltrials.gov

Natural Drainage Systems
Seattle Public Utilities, Resource Planning Division
Key Tower Building
700 5th Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98104-5004
Phone: 206-684-4601
Fax: 206-386-9147
www.seattle.gov/util/about_spu/drainage&_sewer_system/natural_drainage_systems/index.asp

Performance Standards for Juvenile Corrections
Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators
170 Forbes Road, Suite 106
Braintree, MA 02184
Phone: 781-843-2663
Fax: 781-843-1688
www.pbstandards.org
Resolve to Stop the Violence Program
San Francisco Sheriff’s Department
City Hall, Room 456
1 Drive Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA  94110-2
Phone:  415-554-7010
Fax:  415-554-7050
www.sfgov.org/site/sheriff_index.asp?id=25413
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Charter Agencies
Department of Management
Room G12, State of Capitol
Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: 515-281-6537
Fax: 5152425897
http://charter.iowa.gov/

Program Assessment Rating Tool
Deputy Director for Management
725 17th Street, NW
Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Room 263
Washington, DC 20503
Phone: 202-395-6059
Fax: 202-456-5938
www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part

Allegheny County Justice Related Services State Support Program
(formerly State Forensic Program)
Allegheny County Department of Human Services
Office of Behavioral Health
Wood Street Commons
304 Wood Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-1900
Phone: 412-350-7337
Fax: 412-350-4395
www.alleghenycounty.us/dhs/

Systematic Code Enforcement Program
Los Angeles Housing Department
1200 West 7th Street, 9th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone: 213-808-8653
Fax: 213-808-8999
www.lacity.org/ahd

The SEED School
The SEED School
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-785-4123
Fax: 202-785-4124
www.seedfoundation.com
Youth Civic Engagement
Coalition for Youth
22 Lincoln Street
Hampton, VA 23669
Phone: 757-728-3280
Fax: 757-728-3281
www.hampton.gov/foryouth/youth_youth.html
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Charter Schools Initiative
Office of the Mayor
2501 City-County Building
200 East Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Phone: 317-327-4930
Fax: 317-327-5271
www.indygov.org/eGov/Mayor/Education/Charter/home.htm

Gay and Lesbian Liaison Unit
Operations Command
MPDC HQ
300 Indiana Avenue, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202-727-5427
Fax: 202-724-4120
http://www.gllu.org/

Grass Roots Conservation Program
USFWS Partners Program
922 Bootlegger Trail
Great Falls, MT 59404
Phone: 406-727-7400
Fax: 406-727-7432
No website available

Health Information Technology
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20420
Phone: 202-273-6643
Fax: 202-273-5787
www.va.gov/vista_monograph/

Supportive Housing Pilots Initiative
Office of Policy and Management
450 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
Phone: 860-418-6268
Fax: 860-418-6487
www.ct.gov/opm/site/default.asp
Teaming
Department of Social Service
24 Farnsworth Street
Boston, MA 02131
Phone: 617-748-2360
Fax: 617-439-4482
www.mass.gov

Urban Academies
Human Resources
1800 SW 5 Places
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312
Phone: 754-323-2155
Fax: 754-323-2146
No website available
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ACCESS Florida: Modernization Eligibility Determination
Department of Children and Families
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Building 1, Room 201
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700
Phone: 850-921-0253
Fax: 850-488-2589
www.myflorida.com/accessflorida/

Citizen and Law Enforcement Analysis and Reporting
Chicago Police Department/ InfoRoomation Services Division
3510 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60653
Phone: 312-745-6392
Fax: 312-745-6920
http://gis.chicagopolice.org/

Climate Protection Initiative
Seattle Office of Sustainability and Environment
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2748
Seattle, WA 98124
Phone: 206-615-0829
Fax: 206-684-3013
www.seattle.gov/environment/

Community Care
Office of the Governor
116 West Jones Street
Mailing Address: 20301 Mail Service Center Raleigh NC, 27699-0301
Raleigh, NC 27603
Phone: 919-733-0153
Fax: 919-733-2120
www.communitycarenc.com/

Electronic Court Records
King County Department of Judicial Administration
King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue Room E-609
Mail Stop: KCC-JA-0609
Seattle, WA 98104
Phone: 206-296-7838
Fax: 206-296-0906
www.metrokc.gov/kcscc/
Overt Drug Market Strategy
High Point Police Department
1009 Leonard Avenue
High Point, NC  27260
Phone: 336-887-7881
Fax: 336-887-7972
www.high-point.net/police/

Urban Land Reform Initiative
County Treasury
1101 Beach Street
Flint, MI  48502
Phone: 810-257-3024
Fax: 810-257-3885
www.thelandbank.org/