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Given Washington’s high profile philanthropy, world-class universities, significant non-profit relief and development organizations, as well as a geographic and economic orientation towards the Pacific Rim, one might presume that Washington State is a significant contributor to poverty alleviation. As a crucial hub for social movements that have challenged the current logic of global trade agreements, consumer movements for fair trade and organic foods, and human rights work, Washington also plays a critical role in addressing social justice concerns with a variety of political and economic tools; however, to date there has been no systematic assessment of the state’s assets and contributions toward economic development, poverty alleviation, or social justice. And, to our knowledge, no other state has attempted such an assessment. This report of the Global State of Washington Initiative takes the first step towards describing the many ways that citizens, organizations, foundations and businesses around the state of Washington work to address poverty and social justice, as well as contribute to the growth of economies without jeopardizing environmental or social cohesion.

The Global State of Washington Initiative
At the start of the Global State of Washington Initiative, preliminary research was undertaken on the global sustainable activities initiated by organizations and individuals based in Washington as well as the global learning opportunities available through the state’s colleges and universities. This economic development, poverty and social justice report is one of four reports based on these research results. The others address global health, humans and the environment, and global learning.

Research about environmental contributions emanating from the state of Washington is part of a larger initiative led by the Global State of Washington team. Beginning in September 2006 through the initiative of the University of Washington’s Office of Global Affairs and the Seattle International Foundation, the Global State of Washington was formalized with the inclusion of Washington State University’s Office of International Programs and a three-way memorandum of understanding in January 2007. The partnership and project are dedicated to bringing Washington’s resources to bear to lower poverty, improve health, preserve the environment, enhance rights and security, and increase opportunities for all people in the state of Washington and around the globe. The Global State of Washington Initiative’s goals are to: (1) increase the effectiveness and impact of Washington State’s global sustainable work, (2) grow awareness and support for our contributions to global sustainable development throughout the state and elsewhere, (3) make the State of Washington an important global center for sustainable development and policy work, (4) contribute to a vibrant economy, attracting investors, creating jobs, and enhancing the quality of life through our work, and, (5) offer Washington State students and citizens the opportunity to be “global citizens.”

In its first nine months, the Global State of Washington Initiative generated significant interest and excitement throughout the state. This was not surprising as statewide initiatives like Washington Learns, the Global Competitiveness Council, and the Life Sciences Discovery Fund...
recognize how the world is changing and work to uncover the ways in which the new global economy will demand responsive citizenry as well as flexible and capable organizations and institutions. As *The Global State of Washington* began to define its scope of work in October 2006 and word started circulating among stakeholders, it soon became clear that there was a high demand for an effort to describe how a global sustainable development sector might be defined in Washington State, and how that sector could contribute to the state’s overall economic and social well-being.

As the research team, the founding partners, and the project’s steering committee members convened during January and February of 2007, it was soon apparent that the research project would be the first step in a larger vision to bring forth, publicize, and grow Washington’s contributions to global sustainable development. To build momentum and develop a vision for Washington in the near future, the *Global State of Washington* facilitated three workshops to discuss each of the three substantive areas of focus: Health, Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice, and the Environment. These three workshops then culminated in a statewide forum on the *Global State of Washington*. The workshops and forum will shape a plan for making the state an important global center for sustainable development and policy work, as well as further contribute to a vibrant state economy.

As Washington looks forward to the next 10 years of economic growth, vital development and continued global engagement, its citizens, organizations and businesses should continue to provide leadership in the areas of global health, poverty alleviation and environmental preservation. To do so, they require a baseline understanding of Washington’s current strengths, continued efforts to communicate and collaborate within and across sectors, and a plan for achievable goals to mark progress. Towards this end, the research presented in this report provides a baseline for such assessments.

The approach taken in this preliminary research effort was to first identify secondary data sources in each of the sectors that would provide an overview of the organizations within each sector (non-profit, academic, and for-profit) engaged in activities contributing to economic development, poverty and social justice. These secondary sources were mined to answer questions about the population and activities of these organizations. In a second phase of the research, more detailed and in-depth investigations explored particular cases and subsets of organizations and activities. This report contains the results of the research project. We provide a brief overview of the research approach and findings here (more details can be found in Sections 1-4).

**Non-Profit Sector Findings**
For the non-profit sector a rich source of secondary data is available through the National Center for Charitable Statistics and the Washington State Charities Database. These data provide information about each Washington-based organization’s name, purpose, mission statement, size, and contact information. Based on these data and supplemented with online research, the team identified 805 organizations engaged in global sustainable development activities (see Section 3 for our definitions). 530 of these organization have been identified as working domestically and the other 275 were identified as working internationally (see Section 2 for definitions). Among these, 265 organizations were engaged in global poverty, economic
sustainable development & social justice activities, 170 of which worked primarily internationally and another 95 of which work primarily domestically. These organizations include but are by no means limited to such programs as the World Impact Network, UNITUS, Global Partnerships, and the Ashesi University Foundation.

During the second phase of research with the non-profit sector, the team administered an online survey and received responses from more than a third of the 805 organizations. Through the survey, they collected detailed information about each organization’s activities, their global reach, recent collaborative projects, and their interest in future collaborations. This research revealed a vibrant not-for-profit sector working on global sustainable development, poverty alleviation and social justice from the state of Washington with comprehensive geographic coverage including work in the US, Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America. These organizations work across the entire spectrum of global sustainable development issues from community development to education and literacy, fair trade, and foreign policy; even so, most economic development, poverty and social justice organizations in Washington focus on the issues of community development, education and literacy, economic development, economic and social inequalities, and employment and income generation. In addition, most of the organizational efforts of the non-profit sector are focused upon public awareness, education, and training. Nonetheless, there is still comprehensive coverage in all other areas of programmatic approaches including technology development, grant making & philanthropy, research, policy, technical assistance, capacity building, service delivery, and advocacy. These same non-profit organizations work with a broad spectrum of populations around the world, from low income communities here in the US and abroad, to children, women, refugees, indigenous peoples, and many more.

Besides demonstrating the comprehensive and vibrant character of the economic development, poverty and social justice efforts of the non-profit sector, the online survey results also revealed that the non-profit organizations take a comprehensive, systemic approach towards their work. A vast majority of organizations tackle poverty and social justice issues while also addressing health and environmental preservation. For example, they may bundle their poverty & social justice programs with approaches that also addresses sustainable agriculture, pollution & toxins, natural disasters, or wildlife preservation; another common example is an organization that addresses a combination of education and literacy, microfinance, or land distribution and reform while delivering health care services.

Finally, the economic development, poverty & social justice non-profit organizations demonstrate that their work moves forward through collaborative efforts both here and around the world. These collaborations have proved vital for organizational success. Nevertheless, most of the collaborations occur within the not-for-profit sector and many fewer collaborations bridge the non-profit with the private or academic sectors. An urgent need identified by the non-profit sector was greater collaboration with the private and academic sectors to better leverage non-profit capacities and resources.

**Academic Sector Findings**
During the first phase of the academic sector research, identifying adequate, secondary databases proved to be more difficult than anticipated. There are no comprehensive databases that could be
efficiently repurposed to answer questions about teaching, research or outreach pertaining to
global economic development, poverty and social justice, or global sustainable development.
Course and research databases are limited to cursory amounts of information and frequently
grant or course titles are opaque, defying categorization. Instead, the team resorted to key
informants and online research. In the first phase, the team focused exclusively upon
Washington’s largest two universities, Washington State University and the University of
Washington. In a second phase the research extended to Washington’s regional universities,
including Western Washington University, Central Washington, Eastern Washington University,
and the Evergreen State College.

The online search of center-based activities provided the best and most comprehensive view of
the formalized activities of the universities’ faculty and students in relation to global sustainable
development. Center- or program- related activities can be the best indication of the breadth and
depth of a university’s collective capacities for addressing issues such as global poverty, and
increasingly provide the infrastructure to support interdisciplinary research, teaching and
outreach. Between the six universities there are 124 centers that address global sustainable
development. Of these, 64 chiefly address global poverty and social justice, 67 address
environmental concerns, and 57 address mainly global health. At UW these centers are found
throughout the campus and range from the Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology in the
College of Arts and Sciences to the Marc Lindenberg Center in the Evans School, while
examples from WSU include the Center to Bridge the Digital Divide and the Center for Social
and Environmental Justice. Still, the other universities have their own centers and sustainable
development programs such as the Northwest and Alaska Tribal Technical Assistance Program
at Eastern Washington University, the Civic Engagement Center at Central Washington
University, the Labor Education and Research Center at the Evergreen State College, and the
newly founded Institute for Global and Community Resilience at Western Washington
University.

The poverty and social justice issues addressed by these centers include the full range of global
poverty concerns. Rather than a predominate focus on community development, university
center activities are oriented towards understanding and addressing economic and social
inequalities as well as economic development. Each university also has a unique and
complementary array of centers, suggesting the possibilities for significant cross-campus
collaborations. To our knowledge, there is only one formalized collaboration between
universities: The William D. Ruckelshaus Center, a collaboration between the UW and WSU.
We would suggest that many resources could be effectively leveraged through greater
collaboration between centers and across the state’s universities.

There are unique clusters of strengths across the six universities. Central Washington maintains
its focus upon domestic environment and health issues while Eastern Washington centers its
attention on domestic poverty concerns with a particular target population of indigenous and
migrant communities. The Evergreen State College concentrates on poverty and social justice as
domestic issues, but approaches the concerns holistically. UW tends to have a more international
focus, with significant strengths in regional and area studies. WSU is more domestically
oriented and applies a large share of its efforts on economic development, poverty alleviation,
environmental sustainability and health. Lastly, Western Washington University seems
concerned with both international and domestic issues of poverty with growing clusters in environmental and global health.

At all universities a sizeable number of centers take a comprehensive approach to economic development, poverty & social justice. Of the 64 university-based centers across the state that address poverty & social justice, 24 also address environmental sustainability and 29 address global health concerns. These centers work on issues both domestically and around the globe.

The limitations of the current databases related to courses and research suggest that it would behoove university institutions to enhance these databases by providing abstracts that describe the courses and project content. Further, including codes about the courses or research as it pertains to its global content, the geographic source of data or location of activities, and the type of collaborating partners and their geographic location would quickly reveal the extent of each institution’s global reach.

**Private Sector Findings**

Our private, for-profit sector research also relied on secondary lists of organizations compiled by several different, issue-based umbrella organizations. This yielded a snowball, convenience sample of 293 Washington companies engaged in global sustainable development philanthropy, product and service development, and operations or business practices. Information about these organizations was supplemented by online research and a select set of key informant interviews. *The 293 companies were identified to be working on 408 global sustainable activities at home and around the world.* These companies include big players like Microsoft and Starbucks as well as smaller companies such as Pacific Market International and Cutter and Buck.

25% of the companies engaged in global sustainable development activities contribute to economic development, poverty alleviation and social justice. Most of the companies in our current sample that are engaged in global poverty activities do so through their operations. Among those engaged in philanthropy, most work on economic development, poverty and social justice, followed by environmental sustainability, and lastly global health. *Philanthropic activities take place all over the world and are the most varied projects within businesses, with 28 Washington companies contributing to 124 different philanthropic projects.* Much of the philanthropic issue focus in the area of global poverty and social justice is on education & literacy (68), economic development (51), and community building (48).

Of the products and services developed by Washington’s private sector for global sustainable development, the smallest proportion addresses global poverty and social justice, which are predominantly labeled products that are fair trade or promote economic development. For example, Moonflower Enterprises sells Fair Trade accessories, purses, bags, jewelry, musical instruments, fine art, weavings, textiles, folk art, educational materials, T-shirts, clothing, home furnishings, and organic coffee produced by Mayan artisans and farmers in Guatemala. Another example is Far East Handicrafts, a direct importer from indigenous craftspeople of Nepal, Tibet, Lao, Cambodia, and Vietnam, specializing in handmade paper and singing bowls.

Assessing the for-profit sector’s operations and business practices proved a more difficult task. Although some organizations publicize these efforts through their annual reports, generally this
data is not easily accessible to the public. Instead, to learn about business practices as they relate to health, poverty or the environment requires primary data collection. This could be accomplished through a survey of a representative sample of businesses in the state of Washington. To our knowledge, there has not been an effort to compile such data. Nevertheless, our key informant interviews revealed a sense of emergent corporate responsibility among Washington’s business leaders to move toward green products and technologies, provide living wages and support the health and well-being of workers and citizens around the world through economic development (26), economic and social inequalities (25), and fair trade (24).

**Conclusion**

Despite the preliminary status of these research results, the data provides a strong and palpable sense of the depth and breadth of the global economic development, poverty, and social justice activities taking place across the state of Washington amongst our citizens and organizations in the non-profit, academic and for-profit sectors. The non-profit sector in particular appears to be a vibrant place making significant contributions. These activities are somewhat matched by those in the academic and for-profit sectors, although data limitations constrain our capacity to make a comprehensive assessment.

This initial data provides a starting point from which we can make recommendations for future contributions to global economic development, poverty and social justice, and broader global sustainable development movements and projects. A striking commonality across all sectors is the comprehensive attention paid to global economic development, poverty, and social justice through the bundling of activities that include work with global health and environmental preservation. Indeed, this may not be surprising given Washington’s unique heritage of natural and human resources as well as its legacy of innovations and entrepreneurialism. Finally, these examples of comprehensive approaches may also point to the uniqueness of the Washington contribution to global sustainable development.
Background on Poverty

NOTE: This background does not address economic development or social justice.

Adjusting the Boundaries of Global Poverty
Extreme poverty within the post-industrial, capitalist economies of the West rarely makes the front page. However, as catastrophes such as Hurricane Katrina and the 2005 riots in Paris uncovered, poverty persists even in high-income countries. The phenomena resulting from poverty worldwide illustrates that poverty is a global challenge.

Measuring Poverty
Until recently, the World Bank’s definition of poverty was looked to as the authority of definitions and measures of poverty. The Bank’s definition of poverty was narrow, looking at developing countries’ GNP and GDP to determine which countries were the poorest, thereby determining which people were the poorest. In this manner, only people receiving extremely low or no incomes in countries with low GNP or GDP were classified as “impoverished” (HDP 1990, 9). This categorization does not take into account impoverished communities within rich nations, such as Native American and immigrant communities in the United States. The omission of other dimensions of poverty also contributes to skewed understandings of what policies could be implemented to spur economic development and contribute to poverty alleviation.

Conceptions of Poverty
Rooted in the activism of the early 1970s but taking-off in the 1990s with the end of the Cold War, there has been a growing consensus among scholars that measures of income distribution do not represent the dire needs of the impoverished around the world (Chossudovsky 1998; Grusky and Kanbar 2006; Nussbaum 2006; Sen 1999, among others). In order to address important and urgent matters of policy, a conceptual understanding of poverty and inequality that reaches beyond the limitations of income needed to be established (Grusky and Kanbur 2006, 2).

Capabilities Approach
The capabilities approach to measuring poverty worked out by philosopher Martha Nussbaum and economist Amartya Sen in the 1990s stems from human rights based development theories and places the individual as a holder of basic rights at the center of the process of development. This conception has caused a shift within some international development agencies from “poverty” to “lack of capabilities,” “vulnerability” and “human security,” with an emphasis on social justice.

The capabilities approach includes a measure of political and civil liberties, and takes into account the social and economic rights that allow people the ability to escape poverty and live lives of their choosing (Nussbaum 2006, 52; Sen 2006, 35).

Human Development Approach

---

1 The majority of this background section was drafted by Heidi Wickersham, Senior, Jackson School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington.
This capabilities approach to evaluating poverty resonates with the United Nation’s definition of human development. In 1990, the first UN Human Development Report was published. This report defined human development as “creating an environment in which people can develop their full potential and lead productive, creative lives in accord with their needs and interests (HDR 1990, 10).”¹ This entails empowering people to govern their lives by ensuring they have access to education, healthcare and essential resources to create a livelihood for themselves and their families. By moving development from the national platform to the individual platform the report stresses significant harms to people that were not being addressed under the former approach, which focused largely on national income (Owen 2004, 18).

**Human Security Approach**
The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) definition of human security is the protection of the vital core of all human lives from critical and pervasive environmental, economic, food, health, personal and political threats (Owen 2004, 20). The decreasing number of wars between states and the concurrent increase in violent conflicts that occur within state (where 95% of conflicts take place), has triggered a need for this new approach to security and development (HSR 2005, VIII). According to the *Human Security Report*, human security is “a relatively new concept, now widely used to describe the complex of interrelated threats associated with civil war, genocide and the displacement of populations” (HSR 2005, VIII). And, although the UN Human Security Report is based on the limited definition of human security as it regards to political violence, it concedes that capturing elements of poverty such as disease and hunger—the major killers—in the definition would be a much more accurate way to understand human security (HSR 2005, VIII).

**World Bank’s ‘Voices of the Poor’**
Many argue that re-conceptualizing poverty has been an important step in understanding the problems poor people face, but others have gone even farther by asking impoverished people how they define poverty. In the 1990s, the World Bank carried out poverty assessments of women and men in 50 countries to find out what is most important for poor people by listening to their experiences, priorities and recommendations.³ The result of these efforts, found in the report *Can Anyone Hear Us*, converge into five main findings: poverty is complex and multidimensional, it is routinely defined as a lack of material well-being, there are important psychological aspects of poverty which can lead to a breakdown of social relations, the absence of infrastructure is critical and, finally, poor people generally link wealth to assets rather than income (Narayan et al 2000, 26).

**Re-measuring Poverty**
As a result of the arguments outlined above, large institutions such as the World Bank have begun to change the way they measure poverty: “As poverty has many dimensions, it has to be looked at through a variety of indicators -- levels of income and consumption, social indicators, and indicators of vulnerability to risks and of socio-political access.”⁴ Although the dollar-a-day

---

¹ UN Human Development website, available: http://hdr.undp.org/hd/
definition is useful in quick assessments of poverty, the Human Development Index (HDI) provides a more comprehensive range of measures. The HDI, a measure used in the UN Human Development Report since 1993, is “a composite index measuring average achievement in three basic dimensions of human development—a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living.” Many institutions use the HDI to measure poverty, but poverty measurement is by no means limited to its dimensions. A few other measures of human development used by the World Bank include: literacy, population growth, carbon emissions, children under height for age, school enrollment, condom use, conventions against inhumane punishment, estimated income, female employment, GDP, and inequality measures such as the Gini index.

These new measures of poverty have led to the creation of new methods for alleviating it and monitoring progress. The UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are an example of concrete goals that have been formed around the new concept of poverty. In 2000, all the world’s countries and leading development institutions agreed to a set of eight development goals to work on by the target date of 2015 that incorporate many aspects of poverty, from economic and material needs to health and environmental issues:

- Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education
- Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women
- Goal 4: Reduce child mortality
- Goal 5: Improve maternal health
- Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability
- Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

How much progress will be made by 2015 is still hard to tell, but the Millennium Development Goals Report for 2006 shows mixed progress towards the first goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger. For example, the proportion of people going hungry in the developing world is decreasing, but the overall number of people without enough food to meet their daily needs has increased (MDGR 2006, 2:5). This shows that re-conceptualizing poverty is not enough; we also need to rethink how we tackle poverty. As embodied by Goal 8, there is a need for increased collaboration and partnership for development, and the rise of both transnational networks and grassroots organizations has already paved part of the way.

**Implications for Sustainable Development**

In an increasingly interdependent world, there is no doubt that global poverty is a pervasive and persistent challenge. Grusky and Kanbar insist that, “There is a growing consensus among academics, policy makers, and even politicians that poverty and inequality should no longer be treated as soft social issues that can safely be subordinated to more important and fundamental interests in maximizing total economic output” (2006, 1). Poverty hinders sustainable development, and is directly linked to reduced health and decreased environmental sustainability.

---

Poverty and Global Health

"The biggest enemy of health in the developing world is poverty."

-Kofi Annan

The World Health Organization states that “Poverty creates ill-health because it forces people to live in environments that make them sick, without decent shelter, clean water or adequate sanitation.” Drastic levels of poverty translate into equally drastic health problems that threaten social, political and economic stability. The UN Millennium Development project devotes the fourth, fifth and sixth MDGs to global health issues. Global health problems not only affect impoverished people in developing nations, but are also an increasing threat to global stability and development as diseases such as avian influenza and the AIDS epidemic migrate across borders.

Poverty and the Environment

The 1998 Human Development Report states, “Poor people and environmental damage are often caught in a downward spiral” (HDR 1998, 66). The report concisely outlines the intertwined problems of poverty and environmental concerns creating barriers for development:

“Past resource degradation deepens today’s poverty, while today’s poverty makes it very hard to care for or restore the agricultural resource base, to find alternatives to deforestation to prevent desertification, to control erosion and to replenish soil nutrients. People in poverty are forced to deplete resources to survive, and this degradation of the environment further impoverishes people” (HDR 1998, 66).

This poverty-environmental damage nexus has severe implications for sustainable development when population growth is taken into account. According to United Nations projections, by the year 2050, 8 billion of the global population will be in developing countries, and this will put great strain on already stretched natural resources in fragile environments (HDR 1998, 66). Environmental sustainability must be considered when focusing on poverty or human development. Green technologies will be crucial, as will policy reforms, institutional arrangements and changes in collective responsibility for the environment (HDR 1998, 83).

Conclusion

Recently we have witnessed a shift in the field of poverty alleviation from top-down efforts by government and international institutions to the bottom-up efforts led by grassroots organizers. In the new millennium, a variety of organizations big and small, private and non-profit, governmental and non-governmental are working together to come up with better solutions to the problems poverty presents. As a result of collaborative, multidisciplinary and cross-sector approaches to global poverty more thorough research has been done into the causes and dimensions of poverty, and more progress has been made to ensure impoverished people have access to valuable resources and tools.

8 ibid.
The way poverty is understood has progressed from a definition of poverty as earning low or no-income to a definition based on a lack of capabilities, human development and human security. This conceptual overhaul has affected not only the definition and measurement of poverty, but has also changed approaches to poverty alleviation. This move towards sustainable and equitable development is even starting to influence governments and large international institutions such as the World Bank. Due to a broadened understanding of what poverty is comprised of, the understanding of global poverty has widened as well. The arbitrariness of defining poverty as “a dollar a day” and waiting for national economies to pick up the slack in alleviating poverty in developing nations has not produced satisfactory results. Only by looking at poverty through the lens of capabilities and lack of human development and human security can we understand the causes and the underlying institutional factors leading to unequal growth and unsustainable development both locally and globally.
Methodology

As a first attempt to observe Washington’s strengths and activities related to economic development, poverty and social justice, this study took a multi-method, multi-pronged approach. Drawing upon key informants, secondary data, an online survey, and in-depth interviews, we have compiled a first look at what is being done throughout the state. We know of no other state that has attempted such an accounting.

To set the stage for our analysis, this section first defines what we mean by ‘sustainable development,’ ‘economic development, poverty and social justice,’ and ‘global’ for the purposes of this research, which paves the way for a discussion of how we observe and categorize activities promoting global sustainable development. In short, we refer to ‘economic development, poverty and social justice’ (EDP&SJ) as an umbrella term that captures a spectrum of economic, social and political issues and concerns. This umbrella term represents one of three non-exclusive and interdependent ‘clusters’ of issues areas that constitute our operational definition of global sustainable development. Lastly, this section describes the methods used to observe economic development, poverty and social justice activities in the not-for-profit, academic, and for-profit sectors.

Defining Terms

Identifying organizations based in Washington and observing their efforts to address economic development, poverty and social justice requires defining terms as they are generally understood and crafting a working definition for the purposes of this study.

**Sustainable development** is defined as a holistic and multi-dimensional development process predicated on economic growth and social cohesion that does not compromise the natural environment. Global sustainable development takes into account the connections between the local and the global, between Washington State and the world. For the purposes of our study, we characterize sustainable development activities broadly to include a range of activities that encompass economic, social justice, health and environmental projects and concerns oriented towards improving human and environmental well-being.

Our working definition of **economic development, poverty and social justice issues** encompasses a spectrum of social concerns and systems that produce material and social gains and inequalities, as well as power relations that can be unequal or unjust. These include global economic systems like trade, economic development, democracy and political participation, as well as social issues such as education, literacy and economic and social inequalities. This approach includes a focus on the agency of individuals that address the poverty and injustice they encounter in their own lives as well as the structural production of inequality and social exclusion. See Table 2.2 for a complete list of the economic development, poverty and social justice issues addressed in this study.

---

Global in this case relates to the social, technological and biophysical systems\textsuperscript{10} that rework boundaries of national borders, class, race, ethnicity and culture. Systems connect what happens here to what happens anywhere else in the world. As such, they draw attention to local action and global awareness.

**Global Sustainable Development Framework**

The figure below describes our three-tier approach for conceptualizing global sustainable development capacity and activity. Organizations, companies and individual actors may take one or more program approaches from philanthropy to education, research to service provisions, advocacy to policy. These approaches may address issues along a continuum of concern from human to environmental well-being. And, the issues addressed through various program approaches are generally situated within a global system that interconnects localities, whether social (political, economic, cultural, etc.), technological (transportation, communication, etc.), or biophysical (ecological, climatic, or epidemiological).

This understanding of the ‘global’ enables us to think about economic development, poverty and social justice activities implemented here in Washington State as connected to the world through the flows and networks of people, goods, and ideas. In other words, this systems approach recognizes that projects and activities that Washington-based organizations conduct in other parts of the globe are likely to have impacts both there and in Washington. Similarly, global health activities conducted in the state of Washington will also generate ripple effects to other parts of the globe through the movement of people, goods and ideas.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure2_1.png}
\end{center}

**Figure 2.1: Three Tier Approach to Global Sustainable Development**

With the aim of capturing these connections through our research, we have identified local sub-populations in Washington State that have strong international connections through mobility, citizenship, communication, and cultural and economic exchange. These Washington sub-populations include: migrants, refugees, immigrants and Native Americans.

\textsuperscript{10} Systems describe the organizational structures and complex processes created from the interactions and transactions of various social actors with and within environmental settings.
Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Activities
Economic development, poverty and social justice activities that target this distinctly global sub-population of people living in Washington State are categorized as ‘Domestic Activities’. ‘International Activities’ refer to efforts of Washington-based organizations to address the health concerns of people living outside the United States. Together, domestic activities and international activities compose our working definition of economic development, poverty & social justice activities.

Table 2.1: Definitions of Domestic, International, and Global Economic Development, Poverty & Social Justice Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitions of Domestic, International, and Global Health Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic EDP&amp;SJ Activities</td>
<td>Activities that target migrants, refugees, immigrants and Native Americans as clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International EDP&amp;SJ Activities</td>
<td>Activities that target populations living outside of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global EDP&amp; SJ Activities</td>
<td>The sum of both Domestic and International EDP&amp; SJ Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This approach represents economic development, poverty & social justice concerns embedded within a larger spectrum of sustainable development issues. Rather than analyzing economic development, poverty & social justice activities in Washington State as distinct from efforts that address environmental degradation and global health concerns, this approach allows us to capture economic development, poverty & social justice activities that address these and other sustainable development concerns.

Global Health Activities
Our approach to global health encompasses the health problems, issues and concerns that transcend national boundaries and are best addressed by cooperative actions. Global health highlights the global interdependence of the determinants of health, the transfer of health risks and the policy response of countries, international organizations and the many other actors in the global health arena. Many organizations working on global health seek to promote equitable access to health in all regions of the globe.

Environmental Activities
In our approach to environmental sustainability, we focus on a wide range of issues and relationships between the environment, humans, and social systems. Climate change, biodiversity, natural disasters, sustainable agriculture, and renewable energy are examples of the variety of issues we understand to influence environment sustainability and to structure the relationship between humans and the environment. In contrast to our analysis of global health, and poverty and social justice activities, we do not distinguish between ‘domestic’ and ‘international’ activities promoting environmental sustainability because we understand environmental systems to be distinctly global.
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Measuring Economic Development, Poverty & Social Justice Activities:
Our methodological approach aims to identify activities and organizations in the not-for profit, for-profit and academic sectors in Washington State that address economic development, poverty and social justice by: issue area, program approach, geography of program implementation, and targeted beneficiaries (or populations). Before discussing our distinct approaches for these three sectors, we first describe our measures of global sustainable development issues (Table 2.2), geography (Table 2.3) and program approaches (Table 2.4).

For the purposes of our study, we have identified 53 global sustainable development issues, which have been grouped into the three broad, overlapping, and non-exhaustive categories of: Global Health, Economic Development, Poverty & Social Justice, and Humans & the Environment. This framework was developed from extensive analysis of existing approaches employed in practitioner and academic publications\(^{13}\), and was further refined through the feedback of over 13 individual sustainable development scholars and practitioners\(^{14}\) in Washington State.

Table 2.2 Global Sustainable Development Issue Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Health</th>
<th>Economic Development, Poverty &amp; Social Justice</th>
<th>Humans &amp; the Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accidental Injury</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Disease</td>
<td>Education &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water &amp; Sanitation Access</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Watersheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Water Borne &amp; Diarrheal Illnesses</td>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Water &amp; Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Drug Access</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS Access</td>
<td>Security, Conflict &amp; Violence</td>
<td>Oceans and Estuaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal, Newborn &amp; Child Health</td>
<td>Land Distribution &amp; Reform</td>
<td>Ecosystems Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Biotechnology</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinals &amp; Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>Internet and Communication</td>
<td>Pollution &amp; Toxins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health &amp; Drug Addiction</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Social Inequities</td>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Employment &amp; Income Generation</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture &amp; Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>Urban Ecology &amp; Sustainable Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive health/Family Planning</td>
<td>Democracy &amp; Political Participation</td>
<td>Eco-tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Earth Institute at Columbia, ‘Cross-Cutting Themes’. Available online: http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/

\(^{14}\) Special thanks to Susan Jeffords, Bill Clapp, Amy Hagopian, Sally Weatherford, Steve Gloyd, Vicky Lawson, Lucy Jarosz, Joel Migdal, Angelina Godoy, Dave Secord, Stephanie Harrington, Chris Pannkuk, Ken Spitzer, and Lance Leloup for shaping this framework.
The geography of program activity implementation has been categorized by country into five regions listed in Table 2.3. The classification scheme we employ in our analysis was developed by the United Nations Statistics Division.15

Table 2.3: Regions of the World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions of the World</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North, Central, South America &amp; the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the survey employed with the non-profit organizations and foundations allowed us to make some finer distinctions about program approaches. Table 2.4 defines the nine types of program approaches employed to categorize global economic development, poverty and social justice activities of non-profit organizations and foundations located in Washington State.

Table 2.4 Categories and Definitions of Program Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories and Definitions of Program Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes public media and education campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes building institutions or institutional strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides technical expertise to other organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes direct services to clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works to increase human capital and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes work with social movements and includes efforts to influence public policy makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides information and area-specific research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes developing technologies or means of applying knowledge to promote sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant making &amp; Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides funds to individuals or organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs are intended to influence and determine decisions, plans, or courses of action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sector Specific Research

15 http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm
For each of the not-for-profit, for-profit, and academic sectors we took a different methodological approach when analyzing organizational activities within those sectors. Each is addressed in turn.

Non-profit sector
Approximately 15,000 not-for-profit organizations with offices located in Washington State and with 501(c)3 status were identified using the National Center for Charitable Statistics and the Washington State Charities databases. Using the organizations’ stated mission statements within these databases, and supplemented by online research, we identified 805 organizations that address one or more of the global sustainable development issues listed in Table 2.2. Based on the issues addressed, organizations were categorized as working in one, two or all three of the global sustainable development issue clusters.

An online survey was administered to the 805 identified organizations addressing global sustainable development. The goal of the survey was to refine our understanding of an organization’s contributions to global sustainable development and to elaborate upon the nature of their collaborations and projects around the world. 295, or 37%, of the organizations fully or partially completed the survey. The survey allowed respondents to identify which of the 53 sustainable development issues they address, and thus which issue cluster(s) the organization belongs to. This research design allowed organizations to select issues across the spectrum of sustainable development issues, from health to economic development, poverty and social justice to the environment. Organizations that self-identified as addressing at least one issue in the category of economic development, poverty and social justice are the focus of Section 3 of this report.

As described in Section 3, survey participants identified which economic development, poverty and social justice issues they address, the program approaches their organization employs to address these issues, the countries and regions of the world where their programs are implemented, and which sub-populations their programs target. In addition, survey respondents described their US and international partnerships and discussed the opportunities collaborations offer, as well as barriers they face in partnering with other organizations. Lastly, respondents offered insight into how private sector companies, academic institutions, state government and other non-profits could enhance the effectiveness of their work.

Academic Sector
For the purposes of this report, we limited our scope to center based activities taking place at the University of Washington, Washington State University, Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, Western Washington University and the Evergreen State College. Together, these institutions constitute the six comprehensive four-year universities in Washington State. While activities taking place across the state in the remaining institutions of higher education and K-12 education certainly merit analysis, a census of academic activities is beyond the scope of this research and poses future directions for further research. Despite this limited focus, this analysis is the first of its kind and provides a window into the collective efforts of Washington State’s universities to address economic development, poverty and social justice issues.
Focusing on sustainable development activity emanating from centers allows us to capture research taking place at universities that is funded both externally and internally. Centers were identified through previous analysis of center activities at the UW, through online research, and through the research conducted for the Global State of Washington Global Learning Report. This distinct study focuses on global learning at 19 of Washington’s four-year colleges and universities and the 34 community colleges, accompanied by interviews with key informants in the 19 four-year colleges.

Private Sector
293 Washington companies have been identified as the initial sample of companies participating in global sustainable development activities. This list of companies was generated through snowball (convenience) sampling, starting from the Puget Sound Business Journal 2006 Book of Lists, the National Green Pages, the Washington Biotechnology and Biomedical Association industry directory, and interviews with business leaders from Boeing, Microsoft, Starbucks and PATH.

Private sector global sustainable development activities have been categorized in three areas: philanthropy, products and services, and operations. Table 2.5 outlines our framework for analysis and defines these three areas of activity by issue cluster. This framework is built upon the Center for Corporate Citizenship categories of private sector activities and was refined based on the definitions of corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship of Washington-based companies.

---

16 291 companies headquartered in Washington are included in this study. Boeing, headquartered in Washington until September 2001, and CH2M Hill are also included due to their unique presence and history in the region, completing the sample at 293.
20 From Boeing, Billy Glover, Managing Director Environmental Strategy Commercial Airplanes and Gordon McHenry, Dir. Corporate Strategy & NW Region Global Corporate Citizenship, were interviewed on March 13th, 2007. From Microsoft, Akhtar Badshah, Director of Community Affairs, and Timothy Dubel, Senior Manager Community Affairs were interviewed on March 16th, 2007. From Starbucks, Dennis Macray, Dir. Business Practices Corporate Social Responsibility, and Brantley Browning, Social Programs Corporate Social Responsibility, were interviewed on March 23rd, 2007. From PATH, Scott Jackson, Vice-President of External Relations, Ellen Cole, Senior Communications Officer, and Jan Jacobs, Director of Development were interviewed on March 30th, 2007.
### Table 2.5: Corporate Citizenship Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Philanthropy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Products &amp; Services</strong></th>
<th><strong>Operations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Companies engaged in philanthropic health activities</td>
<td>Companies producing products and services that address health needs</td>
<td>Companies integrating health concerns into their business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development, Poverty &amp; Social Justice</strong></td>
<td>Companies engaged in philanthropic economic development, poverty &amp; social justice activities</td>
<td>Companies producing products and services that address economic development, poverty &amp; social justice needs</td>
<td>Companies integrating economic development, poverty &amp; social justice concerns into their business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td>Companies engaged in philanthropic environmental activities</td>
<td>Companies producing products and services that address environmental needs</td>
<td>Companies integrating environment concerns into their business practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities in Washington’s Non-Profit Sector

250 women [were] trained in income generating skills over the last six years in Uganda ending in 2006. This has resulted in the trained women starting their own businesses, employing other locals, writing business plans, using websites as a promotion tool and finding outlets for their marketable products. It has also resulted in U.S. volunteers individually contributing to orphan scholarship programs in order to help house, educate and care for the many orphans found in the areas in which we worked.

- World Impact Network

90% of Ahesi’s students were employed within 3 months of graduation; seven were placed in internship programs at international corporations; and the student body as a whole continued its prize winning tradition: Ashesi students won the Standard Chartered Bank Innovation Incubator competition for its Information Technology-based banking product.

- Ashesi University Foundation

Decrease participants’ barriers to self-sufficiency and increase participants’ knowledge of American culture, laws and systems; community integration; civic participation; and self-confidence through cultural orientation and assistance services.

- Ukrainian Community Center of Washington

These quotes were collected as part of the Global State of Washington survey, in response to a question asking about organizational accomplishments. These accomplishments highlight just a small portion of the global economic development, poverty and social justice work being done by Washington-based non-profit organizations and foundations.

Washington has a strong non-profit sector. The initial database of organizations used in this research listed 15,000 organizations based in Washington filing for tax exempt status in 2006. These organizations are mission driven, and are staffed with passionate people (often volunteers) working to “make a difference.”

This section will look at the global economic development, poverty and social justice (EDP&SJ) issues addressed by Washington’s non-profit organizations and foundations, the activities those organizations are undertaking, and the populations and geographies targeted by those activities.

21 501 (c) organizations include: 501(c)(1), corporations organized under acts of Congress such as Federal Credit Unions; 501(c)(2), title holding corporations for exempt organizations; 501(c)(3), various charitable, non-profit, religious, and educational organizations; 501(c)(4), various political education organizations; 501(c)(5), labor unions and agriculture; 501(c)(6) business league and chamber of commerce organizations; 501(c)(7), recreational club organizations; 501(c)(8), fraternal beneficiary societies; 501(c)(9), voluntary employee beneficiary associations; 501(c)(10), fraternal lodge societies; 501(c)(14), credit unions; 501(c)(19) or (23), U.S. Veterans’ posts and auxiliaries.
The section concludes with a snapshot of organizations working across global sustainable development issues, as well as a quick look at collaborative activities in global EDP& SJ.

**Washington’s Tax Exempt Organizations**

Of the approximately 15,000 organizations registered in Washington State under IRS provision 501(c) (which grants federal tax-exempt status to organizations including non-profits, foundations, and political education associations), 805 were identified through their mission statements to be carrying out activities fitting within this project’s definition of global sustainable development. Among these, 23% work in global health (183 organizations), 32% work in economic development, poverty, & social justice (259 organizations), and 55% work in humans & the environment (439 organizations). (See Figure 3.1)

![Figure 3.1 Global Sustainable Development Issue Areas](image)

**Table 3.1 Washington State Non-Profit Organizations’ Distribution across Issue & Global Focus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Organizations working on global issue domestically</th>
<th>Organizations working on global issue internationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 See the methodology section for more information on the definition of global sustainable development and further information about the methods used to develop and implement this survey.

23 See the methodology section for a detailed explanation of the differences between domestic and international global sustainable development work.

24 Total does not equal 805, as some organizations work on multiple issue areas.
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While the full database of 805 non-profit organizations and foundations was classified through examinations of mission statements and websites, organizations were also asked to self-identify by means of an online survey, distributed to all 805 organizations in the population. Of these 805 organizations, 295, or 37%, took part in the survey.

Table 3.2 outlines the issue clusters that these 295 organizations self-identified through the survey. This categorization is not separated into domestic and international global sustainable development work, as organizations were not asked to identify an international or domestic focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Organizations’ self-identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty &amp; Social Justice</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Washington’s Global Reach**

Washington’s global economic development, poverty and social justice non-profit organizations and foundations work throughout the state, the country, and the world. Programs linked to Washington State are implemented in places as diverse as Costa Rica, Papua New Guinea, and Sri Lanka.

Of the 174 surveyed organizations working in EDP&S, 66 have programs working exclusively with global populations in the United States, and 11 work with populations both at home and abroad. 51% work internationally (88 organizations), and 49% implement their programs domestically (86 organizations). The greatest number of Washington’s EDP& SJ non-profit organizations and foundations work internationally in the Americas (58), followed by Asia (43) and Africa (42).

Figure 3.2 shows the various geographic regions where Washington’s EDP& SJ non-profit organizations and foundations have programs.26

---

25 Total does not equal 295, as some organizations work on multiple issue areas
26 The following outline the actual number of organizations working in each region: United States, 66; Africa, 42; Asia, 43; Americas (non U.S.), 58; Europe, 23; Oceania, 11.
Figure 3.2 Global EDP&SJ Non-Profit Organization and Foundation Geographic Reach

Global Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issues

Washington’s non-profit organizations and foundations are working on a wide range of global EDP&SJ issues. These issues run the gamut from microfinance to economic development. The global EDP&SJ issues most often addressed by Washington’s non-profits and foundations are community development (64%) and economic development (51%). Migration, foreign policy and international trade were selected by 10% or less of the organizations responding.

Table 3.3 indicates the number of organizations identifying each individual issue of global EDP&SJ as an area where they work.

Table 3.3 Non-Profit Organization and Foundation Global EDP&SJ Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issue Areas</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Working on Issue</th>
<th>Percentage of Organizations Working on Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Social Inequalities</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Income Generation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy &amp; Political Participation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Distribution &amp; Reform</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Communication</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Trade</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approaches to Global Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issues

Washington’s non-profit organizations and foundations take a variety of approaches to the global EDP&SJ issues they address. Among the most common approaches to EDP&SJ issues were improving education & training (80%) and increasing public awareness (78%).

A variety of program approaches were presented in the survey. Figure 3.3 indicates the number of organizations selecting each type of program approach.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Percentage of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmaking</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3 Non-Profit Organization and Foundation Global EDP&SJ Program Approaches

Target Populations

75% of the organizations working on global EDP&SJ target specific population groups. The populations most targeted by organizations working on global health issues in Washington are people from lower income brackets, teens, children, adults and women. 10% or less of the organizations targeted victims of violence, gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, trans-sexual, queer populations or sex workers.

27 The following outlines the actual number of organizations identifying each approach: Education & Training, 139; Public Awareness, 135; Advocacy, 85; Service Delivery, 71; Capacity Building, 71; Technical Assistance, 69; Policy, 65; Research, 42; Grantmaking & Philanthropy, 35; Technology Development, 31.
Table 3.4 indicates the number of organizations specifically targeting each population.

### Table 3.4 Non-Profit Organization and Foundation Global EDP & SJ Target Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Target Populations</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Targeting Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Organizations Targeting Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization does not target a specific population</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous People</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic or Racial Minorities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's membership base</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected and/or Government Officials</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Population</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business leaders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Workers (domestic or international)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Violence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Trans-sexual, Queer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations Working Across Issues**

Organizations completing the survey did not have to pigeonhole themselves into one issue or another. It is striking that the majority of the organizations surveyed (79) chose issues across the spectrum of health, poverty and the environment. Only 21 organizations selected issues exclusively from the category of economic development, poverty and social justice.

Figure 3.4 shows how organizations’ issue areas break down across issue clusters. The cases listed pertain to those organizations identifying themselves as working exclusively on each issue or set of issues.
The most common environmental issues selected alongside economic issues were sustainable agriculture and watersheds.

Table 3.5 outlines all of the environmental issues that were also selected by organizations selecting EDP&SJ issues.

**Table 3.5 Environmental Issues Selected with EDP&SJ Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humans &amp; the Environment</th>
<th>Number of Organizations working on EDP&amp;SJ and Environmental Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture &amp; Farming</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watersheds</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Environmental Conceptions &amp; Behavior</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sanitation</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Ecology &amp; Sustainable Cities</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystems Services</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution &amp; Toxins</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceans and Estuaries</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-tourism</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental History</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most common health issues selected alongside economic issues were nutrition and clean water.

Table 3.6 outlines all of the health issues that were selected by organizations that selected EDP& SJ issues.

### Table 3.6 Health Issues Selected with EDP& SJ Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Issue</th>
<th>Number of Organizations working on EDP&amp; SJ and Environmental Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water &amp; Sanitation Access</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal, Newborn &amp; Child Health</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Water Borne &amp; Diarrheal Illnesses</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Disease</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health &amp; Drug Addiction</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine-Preventable Diseases</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive health/Family Planning</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Drug Access</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Recovery</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper &amp; Lower Respiratory Infection</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal &amp; Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental Injury</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Biotechnology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Profit and Foundation Collaborations**

*We are working on giving disadvantaged children a headstart in their life by improving their nutritional, psychological and educational wellbeing, whilst improving their home and community environment*

-Cigarra, in collaboration with Vista Hermosa Hospital, INCCA University, Bienestar Familiar, St. George's School and Servivienda
Promoting the connection between literacy, education, and awareness to economic success in the 21st century and how it will be highly dependent on a workforce committed to lifelong learning. Successful outcomes are: higher levels of immigrants learning English and entering education venues, higher levels of high school completion, adding to a HS diploma certificates, AA degrees, etc.

- Lewis County Literacy Council, in collaboration with Lewis County Superior Court, Book Warehouse, Bocatta Deli & Market, PageAhead Foundation, and Lewis County Jail

These quotes were collected from the survey, in answer to a question regarding the outcomes of collaborations. It is clear from the survey responses that Washington State has a healthy collaborative environment. 77% of the EDP&SJ organizations surveyed identified that they collaborate with other organizations domestically and 40% have collaborations internationally. These collaborations span the globe. The greatest number of collaborations was with others in the non-profit sector.

The most common program approaches to collaborate around were education & training (88) and public awareness (87). The greatest number of international collaborations took place in Africa (23), and Asia (23).

Figure 3.5 and 3.6 illustrate the spread of collaborations across sectors for Washington’s EDP&SJ non-profit organizations and foundations, both within the U.S. and internationally.28

---

Note that respondents were asked to identify two collaborations, so these numbers aggregate answers about each partner.
Conclusion

The data that has been collected in this study of Washington State’s non-profit organizations and foundations working on global economic development, poverty and social justice issues confirms the initial broad hypothesis of the Global State of Washington project: there is a lot of work occurring in global EDP&SJ emanating from the state of Washington.

The data collected on non-profits and foundations also shows us that there is a wide range of global economic development, poverty and social justice programming being implemented around the world, both inside Washington State and in every region of the world. Issues addressed range from the systemic, such as land distribution & reform and international trade, to the individual, such as human rights and social inequities.

Wide spectrums of populations are targeted by Washington’s global EDP&SJ organizations, from women to refugees to business leaders. An interesting finding from the survey is that organizations really see themselves as working across issues of health, poverty, and the environment. This may be why so many of them have undertaken collaborative projects with partners both within the United States and abroad.

There is a speculation that a lack of knowledge about the statewide activities in global EDP&SJ affects the efficacy of that work. The findings from this survey of the activities and foci of Washington State’s non-profit organizations and foundations demonstrate that there is already a great deal of cross-issue and cross-sector collaboration in the field of global EDP&SJ, and that the success of these existing collaborative activities calls for efforts to bolster such initiatives. This report can contribute to this effort by giving an aggregate view of the state’s current core competencies.

This snapshot of Washington’s non-profit sector can contribute to the state’s ability to promote Washington as a region of excellence in education, research, service and advocacy in global EDP&SJ issues. There is a large number of organizations working on and passionate about global EDP&SJ issues in this state. The database of non-profit organizations and foundations
developed out of this research will greatly benefit Washington State and its global EDP&SJ organizations by giving them easy access to information about other organizations and individuals working on global EDP&SJ and other sustainable development issues. This information can be used not only to make contacts and improve partnerships and collaborations, but can also help the state identify areas where its organizations truly excel. These areas of global sustainable development work, evidenced across issues as well as sectors, will be invaluable when taken to the next step: to develop Washington State’s resources into an integrated system working to influence global sustainable development worldwide.
Activities in Washington’s Academic Sector

Washington State is home to 19 accredited, non-professional four-year degree-granting institutions of higher learning. These academic institutions promote sustainable development here in Washington State and across the globe in numerous ways. They play a key role on our state’s economy, produce world-class research, serve Washington State’s population through community extension and outreach, and most importantly, educate and prepare students to become global citizens.

Our assessment of the academic sector's activities in economic development, poverty and social justice examines center- and program- related activities. Center- or program-related activities are the good reflections of the cross-cutting and interdisciplinary responsiveness of the institutions and individuals working within them. As knowledge has grown and the issues and concerns of the globe become more complicated, single disciplinary responses have fallen short of providing adequate training or knowledge. Increasingly, universities have responded to this dilemma by establishing interdisciplinary structures that create communities of collaboration across disciplines to focus on particular intersections of ideas or problems. Center or program related activities can be the best indication of the breadth and depth of a university's collective capacity for addressing issues such as global economic development, poverty and social justice. As such, center- or program-related activities increasingly provide the infrastructure to support research, teaching and outreach.

This analysis of center-based activities is limited to the six public four-year universities in Washington State: the University of Washington (UW), Washington State University (WSU), Central Washington University (CWU), Eastern Washington University (EWU), Western Washington University (WWU) and the Evergreen State College (Evergreen). Center-based research, teaching and outreach housed at WSU, CWU, EWU, WWU and Evergreen are not as well represented as activities taking place at the UW. This bias stems from the research being lead and conducted by UW faculty, staff and research assistants, a bias we aim to address in future Global Washington research projects. For a complete list of the centers included in this analysis see Appendix II.

While the activities taking place across the state in institutions of higher learning in areas of teaching, research and K-12 education certainly merit analysis, a census of academic activities is beyond the scope of this research but provides directions for future research. Despite this limited focus, this analysis is the first of its kind and provides a window into the collective efforts of Washington’s universities in promoting economic development, social justice and alleviating poverty.

In addition to these efforts, our research team has identified international and global learning opportunities for students at 19 four-year degree granting institutions in the state of Washington in addition to an aggregate view of the 34 community and technical colleges, which is the subject of the Global Learning Report.
For the purposes of our research, ‘centers’ are identified and defined by engaging in research or community outreach activities. While most centers included in this analysis also teach students through center-affiliated courses or programs, centers or programs that solely teach matriculated students were not included. Centers addressing economic development, poverty and social justice issues have been identified using a multi-method approach. Activities emanating from the UW were identified through previous research conducted by the Office of Global Affairs benchmarking the UW’s international activities, through data collection on international resource centers and research institutes for the forthcoming global learning report, and online research.

To date, our research has identified a total of 124 centers engaged in global sustainable development. As detailed in table 4.1, 64 of the centers address issues of economic development, poverty and social justice, 67 centers promote environmental sustainability, and 57 centers address global health concerns.

![Figure 4.1 University Center-Based Activity by Issue Area](image)

Figure 4.1 University Center-Based Activity by Issue Area

Of the 64 centers in Washington State that address poverty and promote social justice, 24 also address environmental sustainability and 29 address global health concerns. This finding suggests that like the non-profit sector, university centers in the state of Washington address global sustainable development through multi-dimensional and holistic approaches, approaches that explore and highlight the inter-connectedness of development issues.
Each of the six universities included in our research exhibit distinct strengths and expertise in economic development, poverty and social justice issues, as well as in the more broadly defined global sustainable development. One large difference between them is the geographic focus on domestic and international EDP&SJ issues. While our universities have a strong focus here at home and abroad, collectively, there are slightly more centers focused on international global health and EDP&SJ issues, and environmental centers demonstrate a stronger focus on domestic issues.

Table 4.1 Domestic and International Focus of University Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Total Number of Centers</th>
<th>Centers Working Domestically</th>
<th>Centers Working Internationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington State academic centers address a variety of economic development, poverty and social justice issues, which are detailed in Table 4.2. These centers address every identified issue and exhibit clear strengths in economic development (29 centers), employment and income generation (27 centers), international trade (13 centers), and foreign policy (16 centers). In addition to these approaches, centers at our six institutions demonstrate an equally strong expertise in approaches that emphasize social justice, which includes addressing human rights (21 centers), democracy and political participation (14) and community development (16 centers). Further, the issues most frequently addressed by Washington State academic centers are economic and social inequalities (35 of the 61 centers), which emphasizes a strong social justice component to center-based activities. Other core competencies include education and literacy (29 centers) security, conflict and violence (16 centers) and internet and communication (18 centers). In sum, Washington based centers exhibit expertise across a spectrum of social concerns, including strengths in conventional approaches to poverty alleviation which are matched by a commitment to addressing inequality and injustice.
Table 4.2 Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issues Addressed by University Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issue Areas</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Working on Issue</th>
<th>Percentage of Organizations Working on Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social Inequalities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Income Generation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Communication</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, Conflict &amp; Violence</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy &amp; Political Participation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Distribution and Reform</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Trade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of this section provides a brief glimpse at the center-based activities taking place at Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, the Evergreen State College, University of Washington, Washington State University, and Western Washington University. In addition to looking at the breadth of sustainable development issues these centers address, the complementary differences between universities are explored and case studies are provided.

Central Washington University

Table 4.3 CWU Center-Based Activity by Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Total Centers</th>
<th>Centers Working Domestically</th>
<th>Centers Working Internationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Washington University center-based activity exhibits a focus on issues pertaining to health and environmental concerns here at home. The center we have identified that addresses issues of economic development, poverty and social justice is the Civic Engagement Center.
The Civic Engagement Center has taken "volunteer service" to a new level by coordinating purposeful and productive service to benefit the local and global community, preserve the environment and use higher education to remediate community challenges. Through Civic Engagement, CWU students are becoming active, concerned citizens working together to make a difference.29

**Eastern Washington University**

Of the centers analyzed at EWU, all seven address economic development, poverty and social justice issues, primarily in Washington State, exhibiting a clear specialization and comparative advantage. This expertise is reflected in the issue areas that EWU based centers address, including: migration (2 centers), economic and social inequality (3 centers) education and literacy (3 centers), employment and income generation (2 centers), and transportation (1 center).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4 EWU Center-Based Activity by Issue Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College Assistance Migrant Program, known as CAMP, is an example of the unique contribution and issue-focus of EWU centers. CAMP is a federally funded program designed to support students from migrant and seasonal farm-working backgrounds during their first year in college. CAMP provides students with both financial assistance and academic support services, with the goal of preparing them to continue at a four year college or university, which enables “81% of EWU CAMP students to be the first in the family to attend college.” 30 The Northwest and Alaska Tribal Technical Assistance Program is another example of the activities taking place in Washington-based universities to address sustainable development issues here at home by assisting tribes to develop transportation resources, infrastructure, and development support.31

**Evergreen State College**

Centers based at Evergreen State College are focused on addressing economic development, poverty and social justice issues here in Washington State. Of the seven centers at Evergreen that address poverty issues, two also address environmental issues, and one addresses health issues, both domestically and internationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5 Evergreen State College Center-Based Activity by Issue Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 (foot: [http://www.takeactioncwu.com/page/Civic_Engagement_Programs](http://www.takeactioncwu.com/page/Civic_Engagement_Programs))
30 See CAMP website, Available: [http://www.ewu.edu/x18092.xml](http://www.ewu.edu/x18092.xml)
31 [http://www.ewu.edu/x1036.xml](http://www.ewu.edu/x1036.xml)
The centers address nearly the full spectrum of poverty and social justice issues (save microfinance) and demonstrate leadership in human rights (5 centers), economic & social inequality (6 centers), education and literacy (6 centers) and community development (1 center). The Center for Community-Based Learning and Action (CCBLA) is an example of this holistic approach to poverty and social justice. The CCBLA supports the partnership of academic programs, students, and faculty with community organizations. CCBLA aims to meet mutually agreed upon community needs to strengthen and enhance student learning through critical engagement.

The Evergreen State College Labor Education & Research Center is an example of a center that addresses economic development and social justice issues here in Washington State. The center “provides a safe forum for workers, community members and Evergreen students to look at their lives and work through the lenses of labor history and political economics. The Center provides a place to think about what a movement for positive change in society should or could look like and develops educational programs in collaboration with organized labor and labor support groups to address relevant issues to worker's unions and work lives.”

**University of Washington**

We have identified 67 centers based at the University of Washington. Of these centers, 34 address economic development, poverty and social justice issues, 32 promote environmental sustainability, and 34 address global health issues. Unlike the other five universities included in our research, in all three issue areas UW centers tend to be more internationally focused.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Total Centers</th>
<th>Centers Working Domestically</th>
<th>Centers Working Internationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 details the issues of focus of UW based centers, which exhibit strength in the areas of economic development (16 centers), economic and social inequalities (17 centers), education and literacy (13), internet and communication (12 centers) and foreign policy (13 centers). Also noteworthy, of the 34 UW centers that address economic and social development, 12 promote environmental sustainability and 19 address global health concerns.

---

32 [www.evergreen.edu/laborcenter accessed 5/2/07](www.evergreen.edu/laborcenter accessed 5/2/07)
Table 4.7 Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issues Addressed by UW Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Security, Conflict, and Violence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social Inequalities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Literacy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Democracy &amp; Political Participation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Income Generation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Communication</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fair Trade</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the centers, the Marc Lindenberg Center for Humanitarian Action, International Development and Global Citizenship, is committed to contributing to a world of sustainable development, human security, good governance and responsible citizenship from the local to the global level. The Center initiates and supports interdisciplinary and cross-sectored transnational action learning programs and networks in a range of areas including the transnational studies initiative, growing knowledge on globalization, disasters and relief, managing aging dams for sustainable development, corporate citizenship and new forms of market regulation, mapping and empowering public health networks in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa.33

Washington State University
27 centers have been identified at WSU; nine of which address economic development, poverty and social justice issues. 22 promote environmental sustainability, and 12 address global health concerns. Of the eight economic development, poverty and social justice centers, seven also address environmental issues and five address issues of health.

Table 4.8 WSU Center-Based Activity by Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Number of Centers</th>
<th>Centers Working Domestically</th>
<th>Centers Working Internationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 depts.washington.edu/mlcenter/, accessed 5/4/07
WSU center-based foci include community development (4 centers), economic and social inequality (4 centers), human rights (2 centers), economic development (5 centers), migration (1 center), housing (1 center), education and literacy (2 centers). Of the nine centers, seven address domestic poverty, three address international poverty. WSU’s domestic focus stems, in part, from its status as a land-grant university. WSU has been entrusted nearly 200,000 acres of state land for agricultural and environmental research purposes throughout the Pacific Northwest. In addition to shaping the focus of WSU research, this unique status has enabled WSU to develop a robust and diverse extension program with 42 extension offices in all 39 counties. These characteristics position WSU to be a leader in domestic sustainable development issues, while UW’s location in Seattle facilitates its connections with international business and non-profit organizations.

The Center to Bridge the Digital Divide at WSU provides a unique example of center-based work that is addressing inequality in access to technologies. The center focuses “on empowering people with the ability to apply technology with imagination and in ways that build community and create opportunity. The CBDD facilitates collaborative partnerships, provides educational outreach, research and policy guidance resulting in expanded access to necessary telecommunications infrastructure and critical information technologies among underserved populations.”

The William D. Ruckelshaus Center, jointly housed at WSU and the UW, is innovative in its collaborative structure and mission. The Center provides expertise to improve the quality and availability of voluntary collaborative approaches for policy development and multi-party dispute resolution. The Center builds on the unique strengths of the two institutions and is dedicated to assisting public, tribal, private, non-profit and other community leaders in their efforts to build consensus and resolve conflicts around difficult public policy issues.

Western Washington University

Table 4.9 WWU Center-Based Activity by Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Area</th>
<th>Total Centers</th>
<th>Centers Working Domestically</th>
<th>Centers Working Internationally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 10 WWU centers identified, six address poverty. Two of the six also address environmental issues and two address health issues in addition to poverty and social justice issues. The foci of WWU centers include human rights issues (4 centers), economic and social inequalities (3 centers), democracy and political participation (2 centers) and economic development (2 centers). In addition to these concerns, WWU centers here at home and around the world increasing access to education and literacy (2 centers), and work to find sustainable solutions to transportation issues, address disaster relief concerns, and promote land reform and fair trade.

34 http://ext.wsu.edu/overview.html
35 cbdd.wsu.edu, accessed 5/4/07
36 http://pcc.wsu.edu/about/index.htm accessed 5/4/07

32
The Institute for Global and Community Resilience is an example of the innovative center-based work taking place at WWU. The new Institute focuses on building community capacity for disaster resiliency, as well as participatory processes in emergency planning here in Washington State, the Pacific Northwest and throughout the world. Responding to a host of contemporary challenges, the Institute goes well beyond an operational-capacity or disaster-relief approach, to instead build proven methods of long-term hazards planning. The institute’s systems approach recognizes the role of uncertainty, places a high importance on the inter-relationships between ecological services and economic livelihoods, and captures the underlying causes of socio-economic vulnerabilities.

**Conclusion**

The economic development, poverty and social justice issues addressed by Washington’s comprehensive university centers include the full range of global poverty concerns. Rather than a predominate focus on community development, university center activities are oriented towards understanding and addressing economic and social inequalities, as well as economic development. Each of the universities also has a unique and complementary array of centers, suggesting the possibilities for significant cross-campus collaborations. To our knowledge, there is only one formalized collaboration between universities, the William D. Ruckelshaus Center, a collaboration between UW and WSU. We would suggest that many resources could be effectively leveraged through greater collaboration between centers and across the state’s universities.

There are unique clusters of strengths across the six universities. Central Washington focuses upon domestic environment and health issues. Eastern Washington focuses upon domestic poverty concerns with a particular focus upon indigenous and migrant communities. Evergreen State College focuses on poverty and social justice as domestic issues, but approaches the concerns holistically. UW tends to have a more international focus with significant strengths in regional and area studies. WSU is more domestically oriented and focuses upon economic development, poverty alleviation, and environmental sustainability and health. Finally, Western Washington University focuses upon both international and domestic concerns of poverty with growing clusters in environment and global health.

At all universities a sizeable number of centers take a comprehensive approach to economic development, poverty & social justice. Of the 64 university-based centers across the state that address poverty & social justice, 24 also address environmental sustainability and 29 address global health concerns. These centers work on issues both domestically and around the globe.

---

37 Gigi Berardi, Interim Director, Institute for Global and Community Resilience, Available: http://resilience.wwu.edu/
Activities in Washington’s Private Sector

121 publicly traded companies are headquartered in Washington State, and more than 250,000 businesses are registered in Reference USA’s database. Companies such as Microsoft, Costco, Nordstrom, REI, Weyerhaeuser, Starbucks, Amazon, and Expedia help create a diverse, robust and thriving economy here in Washington. The economic impact of these companies extends well beyond our state to the global economy, through the creation of jobs, the manufacturing and trade of products, the provision of services, and contributions to philanthropy. Our private sector firms are crucial to our state’s innovative and entrepreneurial spirit and energy. This energy is being harnessed to address global sustainable development issues in a multitude of ways.

This section describes the global sustainable development contributions of Washington State’s headquartered companies, with a particular focus on economic development, poverty and social justice (EDP&SJ). These activities are often described as corporate social responsibility or corporate citizenship. While an exhaustive account of these initiatives is outside the scope of this research, this section will provide the first analysis of the collective EDP&SJ efforts and activities of companies headquartered in Washington State. To this end, we first review the terms corporate citizenship and social responsibility, then briefly review the definition used in this research.

Corporate Citizenship & Social Responsibility

In recent years many corporations and small enterprises have begun to challenge business models that evaluate success strictly by measuring the bottom line. Today, environmental regulations and labor laws, pressure from consumers, and increased social consciousness have resulted in a corporate shift toward greater emphasis on sustainability, accountability, and equity. As result some corporations have begun to demonstrate leadership and innovation in social and economic development, environmental conservation, health care, and humanitarian relief.

Companies are now recognizing that in addition to meeting requirements set by governments and regulating bodies, corporate social responsibility and sustainability are also good for business. For example, investments in sustainable agriculture increase the supply of primary products for companies like Starbucks and Weyerhaeuser, fairly traded and organic products often have higher market values, and investments in the work place lead to greater employee satisfaction and employee retention.

Corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship are defined in several ways, which we review before introducing our framework for classifying private sector activities that promote global sustainable development.

Definition and Justification for Corporate Social Responsibility

---

38 Reference USA database, http://www.referenceusa.com/
39 The terms corporate social responsibility (CSR), corporate citizenship (CC), and corporate responsibility systems (CRS) are used interchangeably.
The Center for Corporate Citizenship at Boston University identifies four core principles of corporate social responsibility: 1) Minimize the negative consequences of business activities and decisions on stakeholders 2) Maximize benefits and contributions to societal and economic well-being 3) Increase accountability and responsiveness to key stakeholders 4) Build support for strong financial results.40

Companies operationalize these principles for a variety of reasons including compliance with national or international trade regulations, ensuring sustainable access to commodities necessary for production, meeting the expectations of more socially and environmentally conscious consumers, increasing profits by fulfilling demand in niche markets for environmentally friendly, socially conscious goods and services, a sense of responsibility to various stakeholders, and the economic benefits that can be gained through compliance with CSR principles. “Ultimately, what distinguishes a company’s practice of corporate citizenship is expressed by the way in which it delivers its core values. The competitive companies of the future will find how to fundamentally align and embed their core values — including the values that society expects them to hold. Values are becoming a new strategic asset and tool that establishes the basis of trust and cooperation.”41

The Corporate Citizenship Framework
This research draws upon the work of groups such as the Center for Corporate Citizenship, companies’ own definitions of corporate social responsibility, and the overall research framework of this project to develop the Corporate Citizenship Framework used in this section.

Table 5.1 defines this framework, based on two dimensions: the domain of activity (philanthropy, products & services, and operations) and the issue area addressed (health, poverty & social justice, and environment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Philanthropy</th>
<th>Products &amp; Services</th>
<th>Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Companies engaged in philanthropic health activities</td>
<td>Companies producing products and services that address health needs</td>
<td>Companies integrating health concerns into their business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development, Poverty &amp; Social Justice</td>
<td>Companies engaged in philanthropic economic development, poverty and social justice activities</td>
<td>Companies producing products and services that address economic development, poverty &amp; social justice needs</td>
<td>Companies integrating economic development, poverty &amp; social justice concerns into their business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Companies engaged in philanthropic environmental activities</td>
<td>Companies producing products and services that address environmental needs</td>
<td>Companies integrating environment concerns into their business practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 Center for Corporate Citizenship
41 Ibid.
Philanthroic activities included are those non-commercial activities that address social and cultural challenges from the local to the global. Products and services included are activities that address societal needs with marketplace solutions and return a profit to the company. Operations included are responsible business practices that integrate a commitment to promoting global sustainable development.

The issues addressed under health, poverty and the environment are those global sustainable development issues previously delineated in the methodology section (section 2).

**Washington’s Companies and Activities**

293 Washington companies were included in the initial sample of companies participating in global sustainable development activities. As outlined in the methodology, this list of companies was generated through snowball (convenience) sampling, starting from the Puget Sound Business Journal 2006 Book of Lists, the National Green Pages, the Washington Biotechnology and Biomedical Association industry directory, the Washington Council on International Trade and interviews with business leaders from Microsoft, Boeing, Starbucks and PATH.

As can be seen in Figure 5.1, 62% of the companies contribute to human and environmental issues (183 companies), 43% contribute to health (128 companies), and 25% contribute to economic development, poverty and social justice issues (74 companies).

42 291 companies headquartered in Washington are included in this study. Boeing, headquartered in Washington until September 2001, and CH2M Hill are also included due to their unique presence and history in the region, completing the sample at 293.


47 Companies often contribute to more than one issue area, so these percentages do not add up to 100%.
These 293 companies were examined and identified to be working on 408 global sustainable development activities at home and around the world. These activities were identified using the same resources as those used to generate the sample companies, secondary materials and primary interviews.

In terms of activities, there were almost an equal number of activities contributing to both the environment and to health. Among the activities, 38% contributed to global health (155 activities), 54% contributed to the environment (219 activities), and 38% addressed poverty & social justice (153 activities).48 (See Figure 5.2)

---

48 Again, these totals do not equal 408, as activities can contribute to more than one issue area.
Types of Corporate Citizenship

Non-profit organizations and foundations contribute to global sustainable development in many ways, depending on the focus of each particular organization. Companies also have various ways of contributing to global sustainable development – or being good corporate citizens. In order to help analyze the various approaches, three domains for analysis were developed to help distinguish company activities. These are: philanthropy, products and services, and operations.

Products and services is the domain of activity where the greatest numbers of Washington’s companies are working (266 companies). It should be noted, however, that the greatest number of activities per company can be seen in the domain of philanthropy, where 28 companies undertake 124 distinct activities. Operations activities are difficult to uncover through secondary research. Nonetheless, this cursory look saw 119 companies undertaking 119 responsible business practices.

A note on bias: the results in the philanthropy section demonstrate a bias that may support the hypothesis that companies doing philanthropy undertake a greater number of global sustainable development activities than those contributing through the production of goods and services or operations. However, philanthropy is the domain of activity most reported in annual reports, and as reports made a crucial contribution to this research the project could be relatively over-represented. The results in the products and services section may support the assertion that this is the most common domain of CSR activity. This may well be true, considering that products and services are the main purview of businesses. Finally, this research has not yet been able to fully examine corporate citizenship taking place through business operations. This is the most difficult area to assess, as CSR reports and websites rarely emphasize companies’ internal business practices to the public.
Table 5.2 defines the domains of corporate citizenship and identifies the number of companies that promote global sustainable development either through philanthropy, producing or performing sustainable goods or services, or conducting business responsibly. It also includes the breakdown of CSR activities across the domains.

Table 5.2: Distribution of Companies and Activities across Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number of Companies</th>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Non-commercial activities that address social and cultural challenges from the local to the global</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products and Services</td>
<td>Activities that address societal needs with marketplace solutions and return a profit to the company</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Responsible business practices that integrate a commitment to promoting global sustainable development</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the domains of CSR activity are broken down across issue areas, some different patterns emerge. As can be seen in table 5.3, although the domain of products and services still dominates in both health and humans & the environment, philanthropy is the most common domain of activity for economic development, poverty and social justice work. Companies engaging in philanthropy most often address economic development, poverty & social justice work (21 companies and 92 activities), while companies engaged with products & services have the greatest number of links to the area of humans and the environment (163 companies and 163 activities). Operations are most responsibly conducted in the area of humans & the environment (90 companies with 96 activities).

In the current sample, products & services dominate activities in both sectors, but most particularly in the category of humans and the environment. A contributing factor to this skew is the large number of products and services that reduce energy consumption or toxin and pollution emissions.

Table 5.3: Number of Companies addressing GSD Issues by Domain of Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H&amp;E Companies</th>
<th>H&amp;E Activities</th>
<th>Health Companies</th>
<th>Health Activities</th>
<th>EDP&amp;SJ Companies</th>
<th>EDP&amp;SJ Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products &amp; Services</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Philanthropy**

One of the most recognizable ways that companies contribute to global sustainable development is through philanthropy. There are a variety of ways that companies accomplish their philanthropic goals. Some companies give through their own foundations, some manage funds from within the corporation, some have matching gift programs that they offer to their employees, and others have additional ways to give. The activities captured in this research undercount Washington’s private sector philanthropic activities, as they do not measure employee match programs, nor do they capture activities other than the representative giving that is published in annual reports.
Nonetheless, the data does give a snapshot of Washington’s private sector philanthropic priorities. Table 5.4 demonstrates that the largest number of Washington’s companies engage with economic development, poverty, and social justice (21 companies), as well as the greatest number of activities (92 activities).

Table 5.4: Philanthropic Companies and Activities by Issue Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Companies</th>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development, poverty &amp; social justice</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the environment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of this section is on the philanthropic economic development, poverty and social justice activities of Washington’s private sector companies. The greatest number of philanthropic EDP&SJ activities are benefiting Asia (30 activities) followed by Europe (with 14 activities).49

Figure 5.3 Geographic Distribution of Poverty, Social Justice, and Economic Development Philanthropy

Washington’s private sector supports a wide range of EDP&SJ activities. For example, Starbucks Taiwan supports education programs for aboriginal children in which Starbucks pay for tuition and school supplies and funds improvements in their schools. In another case, Microsoft funds innovation centers in Brazil that offer training scholarships and research opportunities for teachers and students; courses, certification, technical guidance for software developers, and specialized services to help companies test their solutions.

Table 5.5 describes the focus of the 92 philanthropic EDP&SJ activities supported by Washington’s private sector. By far the largest number of activities relate to education and

49 Activities for each region: Asia, 30; Europe, 14; Global, 14; Americas, 12; Africa, 10; USA, 9; Oceania, 3.
literacy (68 activities). The next strongest focus is on economic development (51 activities) and economic and social inequalities (50 activities).

**Table 5.5: Global Economic Development, Poverty and Social Justice Issues Supported by Private Sector Philanthropy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global EDP&amp;SJ Sub-Issues</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Social Inequalities</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Income Generation</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Communication</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, Conflict, and Violence</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Trade</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy &amp; Political Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Distribution &amp; Reform</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Products and Services**

Many firms in Washington State promote global economic development, social justice and sustainable development through production and service activities that return a profit to the company. This is by far the largest domain of activity for Washington’s private sector. Many of the products and services that contribute to EDP&SJ are fair trade products and other income-generating products. For example, The Ojoba Collective offers Fair Trade endorsed, high quality, handpicked drums, percussion, shea butter, baskets, modern apparel, and accessories. Mariposa Indigenous Art imports traditional, artisan-quality masks, handwoven bags, and other accessories from the indigenous tribes of Costa Rica.

Table 5.6 describes the number of firms from our sample engaged producing goods and providing service that promote global sustainable development.

**Table 5.6: Products and Services Related to Global Sustainable Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Companies</th>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP&amp;SJ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans &amp; the Environment</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 describes the focus of the 43 EDP&SJ products and services produced by Washington’s private sector. The largest numbers of goods and services are related to education and literacy (21) and fair trade (18). Economic development products came in a strong third (16).
Table 5.7: Products and Services by Issue Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global EDP&amp;SJ Sub-Issues</th>
<th>Number of Products and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Literacy</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Trade</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic &amp; Social Inequalities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Income Generation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, Conflict, and Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Distribution &amp; Reform</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy and Political Participation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations**

Businesses can promote global sustainable development not only through production and service provision, but through their operations and business practices as well. It is well known that a majority of sustainable operations in the fields of EDP&SJ are in the issues of economic development (26), economic and social inequalities (25), and fair trade (24).

**Conclusion**

Washington’s private sector companies contribute to global sustainable development across the areas of philanthropy, goods and services, and operations. Philanthropic activities related to economic development, poverty and social justice are implemented both at home in Washington State, and across the world. The majority of funded projects examined thus far reflect some of the strengths of the non-profit sector here: education and literacy, as well as community building. More research is forthcoming on these philanthropic activities.

Washington’s companies contribute goods and services to a differing range of economic development, poverty and social justice issues. These products and services primarily center on fair trade or trade promoting economic development.

One direction for future research indicated by this for-profit research must look further into the operations of Washington’s companies. There are surely many more activities that have not been uncovered that integrate economic development, poverty and social justice concerns into their
business practices. These have not yet been captured, but call for a more rigorous and systematic research instrument, such as a survey similar to that used for the non-profit sector.
## Appendix I: Non-Profit Organizations Responding to Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A World Institute for a Sustainable Humanity</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>ECOSTUDIES INSTITUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ADOPT-A-STREAM FOUNDATION</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>ECOTEACH FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADOPTION ADVOCATES INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Educational Resources Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agathos Foundation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Elisabeth Carey Miller Botanical Garden Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aglow Relief</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Embrace Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry Education Foundation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Empty Vessel Ministry Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AGROS International</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>ENTRE HERMANOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AHOPE for Children</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Environmental Media Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Airboats North By Northwest</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Environmental Policy Interest Coalition, The Eppard Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ameri-Asia Charities, Incorporated</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Fisher Broadcasting Company Minority Scholarship Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union of Washington Foundation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>For the Children of the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP FOUNDATION</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Foundation For The Orphanage Of The Virgin Of Guadalupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Architects Without Borders Seattle</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>FOX ISLAND MUTUAL WATER ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ashesi University Foundation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>FRED HUTCHINSON CANCER RESEARCH CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander Women &amp; Family Safety Center Bahia Street</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BAINBRIDGE ISLAND LAND TRUST</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF CAMANO ISLAND PARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>BLACK MOUNTAIN FORESTRY CENTER</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF SEATTLES OLMSTED PARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Blue Earth Alliance</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF SKAGIT COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Blue Mtn. Resource Conservation &amp; Development Council</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Friends of the Anacortes Community Forest Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Boreal Songbird Initiative</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF THE Cedar River Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Botswana Orphan Program</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF THE FIELDS INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Breakthrough Partners</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Friends Of The Hylebos Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bremerton Rotary Foundation</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Friends of Pierce County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BRIDLE TRAILS PARK FOUNDATION</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF THE FIELDS INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Brigand's Hideout</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Giving Anonymously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cafe Femenino Foundation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Glaser Progress Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cambodia Tomorrow, Inc. DBA Cambodia Tomorrow</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Global ENT Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Carbon Forest Foundation, The</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Global Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Care To Help Project</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>GLOBAL VISIONARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>CASA LATINA</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>GREAT PENINSULA CONSERVANCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>CASCADE HARVEST COALITION</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>GREENBANK FARM MANAGEMENT GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>CHAMBERS CREEK FOUNDATION</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>HANDS OF HOPE FOR HUMANITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Chaya</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>HARDY FERN FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>CHERUBS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Healing the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>CHEWUCH BASIN COUNCIL</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Health Alliance International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Childcare Worldwide</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>HEALTH EMERGENT INTERNATIONAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Children of the Nations</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>HENRY M JACKSON FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Cigarra</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Heritage University HEP Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>CITIZENS FOR A HEALTHY BAY</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Hispanic Roundtable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>COLUMBIA PACIFIC RESOURCES CENTER INC</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Confluence Project</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Humble Hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>COWICH CANYON CONSERVANCY</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>IAM Children's Family Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cross Cultural Health Care Program</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Cuentas de Esperanza (Beads of Hope)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Divers Ecological Society</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>DRY CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION INC</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Earth Economics</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>EARTH MINISTRY</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>EARTH SYSTEMS INSTITUTE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>EarthCorps</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ECO ENCORE</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>INDIAN AMERICAN EDUCATION FOUNDATION</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>NORTH CASCADES INSTITUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>INFECTIOUS DISEASE RESEARCH INSTITUTE</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>NORTH OLYMPIC SALMON COALITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Initiative for Global Development</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Northwest Biosolids Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>INLAND POWER &amp; LIGHT CO</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>NORTHWEST COMMUNITY LAND TRUST COALITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>International Bicycle Fund</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>NORTHWEST ENERGY EFFICIENCY COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>International Children's Drive</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>NORTHWEST HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>International Children's Network</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Northwest Natural Resource Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>International Childrens Outreach Network</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>NORTHWEST NATURAL RESOURCE GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL DISTRICT HOUSING ALLIANCE</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>NORTHWEST NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>International Drop-in Center (IDIC)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>NORTHWEST PERENNIAL ALLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>International Evangelism Outreach</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>NorthWest Sustainable Energy for Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>International Smile Power Foundation</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>NorthWest Wilderness and Parks Conference NWWPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>International Snow Leopard Trust</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>NORTHWEST WILDERNESS PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Intracranial Hypertension Research Foundation</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>NOVA SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>IRTHLINGZ</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>NURIA PAGES FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Islandwood</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>NW ENERGY COALITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Ivory Coast Medical Relief Team (ICMRT)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>OCEAN INQUIRY PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>JEFFERSON LAND TRUST</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Olympia Salvage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>JJII FOUNDATION</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>OPAL COMMUNITY LAND TRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Kin On Health Care Center</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>OPERACION ESPERANZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Kind-Hearts Child Aid Development Organization</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Orca Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>KITTITAS CONSERVATION TRUST</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Organic Seed Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>KRUCKEBERG BOTANIC GARDEN FOUNDATION</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Orphan's Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>LEAD INTERNATIONAL MINISTRY NETWORK</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>PACIFIC ECOLOGICAL INSTITUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>LELO Legacy of Equality, Leadership and Organizing</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>PACIFIC NORTHWEST SALMON CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Lewis County Literacy Council</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Pacific Sound Resources Environmental Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>LifeNets - Puget Sound</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>PADILLA BAY FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Lighthouse Environmental Programs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>PARTNERS FOR HEALTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>LINGOS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Partnership For A Sustainable Methow, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Literacy Council of Kitsap</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Passing The Light Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Literacy Source, A Community Learning Center</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Long Live the Kings</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>PAUL G ALLEN FAMILY FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Lopez Community Land Trust</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>PCC FARMLAND TRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>PENINSULA TRAILS COALITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Lummi Island Community Land Trust</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>PIPELINE SAFETY TRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Lummi Island Heritage Trust</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Planet Earth Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Maasai Environmental Resource Coalition</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>PLANTAMNESTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Marine Affairs Research And Education</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>POINT DEFIANCE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>MBO Development Foundation</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>POOREST OF THE POOR EDUCATION FOUNDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>MEDIA ISLAND INTERNATIONAL DTD 0391</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>P-Patch Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>MEDRIX</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Prakash Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>METHOW RECYCLES</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>PRESERVE OUR ISLANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Middleton Foundation For Ethical Studies</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Project Uplift, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>MISSION AND WELFARE SOCIETY-INDIA</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Protect the Peninsula's Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Nature Consortium, The</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>PUGET CREEK RESTORATION SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>NATURE VISION INC</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>PUGET SOUNDKEEPER ALLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>NatureScaping, Wildlife Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>PURA VIDA PARTNERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Neighborhood Farmers Market Alliance</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Rabour Village Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>New World Villages</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>RAINCOAST CONSERVATION SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Nisqually Reach Nature Center</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Rainier Valley Community Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>NISQUALLY RIVER FOUNDATION</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>RE SOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>RenegAID(tm)</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Tri-State Steelheaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 210  | RHODODENDRON SPECIES FOUNDATION |
| 211  | Rose International Fund For Children, The |
| 212  | Roses And Rosemary |
| 213  | Rural Development Institute (RDI) |
| 214  | SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL |
| 215  | Sahar Thomas Education Fund |
| 216  | SAN JUAN PRESERVATION TRUST |
| 217  | Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition |
| 218  | Sea Shepherd Conservation Society |
| 219  | SEA-MAR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER |
| 220  | SEATTLE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE |
| 221  | SEATTLE URBAN NATURE PROJECT |
| 222  | Servants to Missions |
| 223  | Shalom Ministries |
| 224  | SHARE IN ASIA |
| 225  | SHARED STRATEGY FOR PUGET SOUND |
| 226  | Shirfan Clinic Foundation |
| 227  | Sister Island Project |
| 228  | Skagit Land Trust |
| 229  | SKAGIT WATERSHED COUNCIL |
| 230  | SKAGITONIANS TO PRESERVE FARMLAND |
| 231  | Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland, aka SPF |
| 232  | Skill Training For Afghan Youth (Stay) |
| 233  | SKOOKUM EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS |
| 234  | SOMALI COMMUNITY SERVICES OF SEATTLE |
| 235  | Songbird Foundation, The |
| 236  | SOROPTIMIST FOUNDATION INC |
| 237  | Soroptimist International of Port Angeles Jet Set |
| 238  | SOUTH LAKE UNION FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS |
| 239  | South Puget Intertribal Planning Agency |
| 240  | South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group |
| 241  | SPAFFORD CHILDRENS CENTER ASSOCIATION |
| 242  | Sportsmen's National Land Trust - Washington Chapter |
| 243  | Starfish Ministries |
| 244  | STEWARDSHIP PARTNERS |
| 245  | Stillwaters Environmental Education Center |
| 246  | STILLY-SNOHOMISH FISHERIES |
| 247  | SUSTAINABLE CONNECTIONS |
| 248  | TACOMA COMMUNITY HOUSE |
| 249  | Tacoma Rescue Mission |
| 250  | TAHOMA AUDUBON SOCIETY |
| 251  | Tathagat Welfare Trust |
| 252  | TEACHERS WITHOUT BORDERS |
| 253  | THE LANDS COUNCIL |
| 254  | THE MOUNTAINS TO SOUND GREENWAY TRUST |
| 255  | Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund |
| 256  | Thurston Santo Tomas Sister County Assoc |
| 257  | TRANSPORTATION CHOICES COALITION |
| 258  | Transportation Choices Coalition |
| 259  | TRANSVERSE MYELITIS ASSOCIATION |
| 260  | TRIBAL SOLID WASTE ADVISORY NETWORK |
| 262  | Ukrainian Community Center of Washington |
| 263  | Unitus, Inc. |
| 264  | Viet Nam Scholarship Foundation |
| 265  | VillageReach |
| 266  | VOLENTES FOR OUTDOOR WASHINGTON |
| 267  | WALLA WALLA WATERSHED ALLIANCE |
| 268  | WA Association of Community & Migrant Health Centers |
| 269  | Washington Environmental Alliance for Voter Education |
| 270  | WASHINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL |
| 271  | WASHINGTON FISH GROWERS ASSOCIATION |
| 272  | WASHINGTON FOREST LAW CENTER |
| 273  | WASHINGTON FOREST PROTECTION ASSOCIATION |
| 274  | Washington Native Plant Society |
| 275  | Washington State Farm Worker Housing Trust |
| 276  | WASHINGTON STATE MARITIME COOPERATIVE |
| 277  | Washington State Migrant Council |
| 278  | Washington Sustainable Food & Farming Network, The |
| 279  | WASHINGTON TILTH ASSOCIATION |
| 280  | WASHINGTON WHEAT FOUNDATION |
| 281  | Washington Wildlife and Recreation Foundation |
| 282  | Water And Sanitation Health |
| 283  | Partnership for Water Conservation |
| 284  | WESTERN LANDS PROJECT |
| 285  | Western Washington Indian Employment and Training Program |
| 286  | WHATCOM LAND TRUST |
| 287  | WHATCOM LITERACY COUNCIL |
| 288  | WHIDBEY ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NETWORK |
| 289  | WHIDBEY WATERSHED STEWARDS |
| 290  | Wild Fish Conservancy |
| 291  | WILD SALMON RIVER EXPEDITIONS |
| 292  | WILLAPA BAY FISHERIES ENHANCEMENT GROUP |
| 293  | Wise Use Movement |
| 294  | WOLF HAVEN INTERNATIONAL |
| 295  | Wolftown |
| 296  | Woodland Park Zoological Society |
| 297  | World Aid |
| 298  | WORLD IMPACT NETWORK |
| 299  | World Medical Fund USA |
| 300  | WORLD OUTREACH MINISTRIES FOUNDATION |
| 301  | WORLD STEWARD |
| 302  | Yakima Area Arboretum |
| 303  | Zoological Society of Washington Cougar Mountain Zoo |
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**Central Washington University Centers**
- Center for Spatial Information
- Civic Engagement Center
- Geo-Ecology Research Group
- Yakima Waters

**Eastern Washington University Centers**
- American Indian Studies Program
- Center for Entrepreneurial Activities
- Center for Farm Health and Safety
- Center for Social Justice Research
- College Assistance Migrant Program
- Division for International Education and Outreach
- Northwest and Alaska Tribal Technical Assistance Program

**The Evergreen State College Centers**
- Bacteriophage Biology
- Center for Community-Based Learning and Action
- The Evergreen Center for Educational Improvement
- The International Canopy Network
- Labor Education and Research Center
- The Longhouse Education and Cultural Center
- Northwest Indian Applied Research Institute At The Evergreen State College
- Reservation Based/Community Determined program
- Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education

**University of Washington Centers**
- Air Pollution Training Center
- Alaska Salmon Project
- APEC Emerging Infections Network (EINet)
- Berman Environmental Law Clinic
- Center for AIDS & STD’s
- Center for Conservation Biology
- Center for Ecogenetics and Environmental Health
- Center for Labor Studies
- Center for Law, Science, and Global Health
- Center for Multicultural Education
- Center for Science in the Earth System (CSES)
- Center for Studies of Demography & Ecology
- Center for Study of Ethnic Conflict & Conflict Resolution
- Center for Sustainable Forestry at Pack Forest
- Center for the Advancement of Health Disparities Research (CAHDR)
- Center for Urban Horticulture
- Center for West European Studies & European Union Center of Excellence
- Center for Women’s Health and Gender Research (CWHGR)
- Center for Workforce Development
- Climate Dynamics Group (CDG)
- Climate Impacts Group (CIG)
- Columbia Basin Research Group
- Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center
- Department of Medical Education and Biomedical Informatics
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Washington Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison Center for Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Business Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Resource Center (GHRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Public Health Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Transnational Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Program in Humanitarian Relief (IPHR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International AIDS/HIV Research &amp; Training Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Health Group (IHG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Health Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Scholars in Occupational &amp; Environmental Health Program (ISOEH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Training and Education Center on HIV (I-TECH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Training and Research in Emerging Infectious Diseases (ITREID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Institute for the Study of the Atmosphere and Ocean (JISAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Lindenburg Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary International Research Training (MIRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Center for Public Health Practice (NWCPHP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of UW-Community Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest Center for Human Health and Ocean Studies (CH2O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Consensus Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program on the Environment (PoE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Center for International Economics (RCIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Marine Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health and Community Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfund Basic Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Center for International Trade in Forest Products (CINTRAFORE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Center for International Studies at the University of Washington’s Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Water Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Coastal Studies Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW World-Wide: IGERT/Sustainable Multinational Collaboration and Challenges to Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Sea Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Poverty Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D. Ruckelshaus Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Washington State University Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Center (ARC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Environmental Research, Education, and Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Integrated Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for International Health Services Research and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Multiphase Environmental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Social and Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Sustaining Agriculture and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center to Bridge the Digital Divide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colockum Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. H. Steffen Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Biological Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate College of Nursing International Learning Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated Agriculture Research &amp; Extension Center (IAREC), WSU Prosser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Carnivore Conservation Lab (LCCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Nutrient Management and Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullman Plant Materials Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Farms Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Fruit Research and Extension Center (TFREC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory (WADDL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D. Ruckelshaus Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoonosis Research Unit (ZRU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Western Washington University Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border Policy Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Cross Cultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Educational Pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Educational Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Law, Diversity, and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Environmental Toxicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Global and Community Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Watershed Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Point Marine Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWU Office of Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3Netics Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3Tier Environmental Forecast Group, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acucula Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adi Thermal Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advanced Imaging Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advantage IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agbanga Karite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alaffia Fair Trade Shea Butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alder BioPharmaceuticals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aller Verte Shirts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alpha Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alpha-Tec Systems, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Amazon.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Amkor Pharma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amnis Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ample Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Anchor Environmental LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Annie Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Applied Process Engineering Laboratory (APEL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Aprons Tied Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Aquatic Research, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ARC Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Archus Orthopedics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ARI Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AudienceCentral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Avista Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Baby Bunz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Barooti Bedwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Barrentine Bates Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bassetti Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Beecher's Handmade Cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Belshire Concrete Restoration, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bennett Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Berryman Family Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Big Dipper Wax Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bio Research Laboratories, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Boeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Boxwood Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Brooks Rand, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Brooks Solar, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Bryant Christie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Burke Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Burnstead Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Café Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Café Humana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Calistoga Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Callison Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Calypso Medical Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Cancer Research and Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Canyon Hydro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Capstone Manufacturing LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Cardiac Dimensions, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cardiac Science Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CardioMetrix, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Carlson Sales, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cascade Design Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Cascade Recycling Center – Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Cascadia Consulting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Cascadian Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Catapult Community Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Catch Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>CDI Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Cell Therapeutics, Inc. (CTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>CellCyte Genetics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>CEPTYR, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Certified Jean Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>CG Therapeutics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Childsake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Chinook Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Choice Organic Teas/Granum, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Chrondrex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Clario Medical Imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cleaner Production International LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>CoAptus Medical Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coffman Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Columbia Gem House, Inc. - Trigem Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>CombiMatrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>ComleGen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Composite Power Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Control Contractors Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Costco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Costich Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Crooked Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Cusp Natural Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Cutter and Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cytopeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Davis Wright Tremaine LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Decent Exposures Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Dendreaon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Dharma Therapeutics Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Dial Discoveries LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>DKA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III: Private Sector Companies Reviewed by this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>DLR Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Dungeness Organic Produce, Nash Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Ecco Recycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Eco Depot, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>EcoDeposits at ShoreBank Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ecolights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ecotope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Eddie Bauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Edtek, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>EES Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>EIC Environmental Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>EKOS Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>EKOS International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>El Quetzal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Elcon Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Ellard Instrumentation Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>EMP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>EndoGastric Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Energy Market Innovations, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Energy NewsData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>EnerWaste International Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>EnvirosIssues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Envirometrics Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Environment International Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Environmental Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Environmental Home Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Essential Baking Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Essential Innovations Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Etubics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Evergreen Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Expedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Far East Handicrafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Fire Mountain Solar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Flying Apron Organic Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Frause Group, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Full Circle Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Ganesh Himal Trekking &amp; Trading Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Genelex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>GenPrime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>GeoEngineers, Inc. Redmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>GGLO Architecture and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Glacier Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Global Energy Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Global Folk Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Global Smart Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Golden Glen Creamery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Grays Harbor Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Green for Good LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>GreenDisk Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Greener Lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Hallmark Lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Hargis Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Harris Group Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Hart Crowser, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Helix BioMedix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Heller Ehrman LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Hematologics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Holland America Cruise Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Hollister-Stier Laboratories LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Holy Lamb Organics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Hydrogen Power Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Icogenex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Illumigen Biosciences, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Inaba Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>InfrastruX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>InnovaTek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Insilicos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Institute for Environmental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Interface Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Intertox, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Island Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>ISM Therapeutics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>IsoRay Medical, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>JAMTOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>JATS Alternative Power Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Jones &amp; Jones Architects and Landscape Architects, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>JX Crystals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Karisma Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Kitsap SEED Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Koronis Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Leader International Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>LifeSpan BioSciences, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Light Green Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Light Sciences Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Lighting Design Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Living Shelter Design Architect, PLLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>LMN Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>LS Pharma, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Lumera, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185. MagnaDrive</td>
<td>232. PCS Utilidata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187. Mahlum Architects</td>
<td>234. PharmaIn, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188. Many Hands</td>
<td>235. PhenoPath Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189. Marigold Fair Trade</td>
<td>236. Port of Everett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190. Mariposa Indigenous Art</td>
<td>237. Port of Longview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191. Mark Ryan Winery</td>
<td>238. Port of Olympia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192. Medchem Source LLP</td>
<td>239. Port of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193. MediQuest Therapeutics</td>
<td>240. Port of Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195. MicroPlanet Technology Corp.</td>
<td>242. Powerit Solutions, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196. Microsoft</td>
<td>243. PriTest Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197. Miller Hayashi Architects</td>
<td>244. Progressive Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198. Miller Hull Partnership, LLP</td>
<td>245. Prometheus Energy Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199. Mithun</td>
<td>246. ProteoTech, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202. Moonflower Enterprises</td>
<td>249. Pura Vida Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203. Morning Myst Botanics</td>
<td>250. Pure Farms Pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204. Mountain Spirit</td>
<td>251. Quilliscuscut cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205. Namu Baru Inc.</td>
<td>252. REI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207. Nastech Pharmaceutical Company Inc.</td>
<td>254. Rent's Due Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208. Natural Choice Directory</td>
<td>255. Sally Jackson Cheeses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209. NBBJ</td>
<td>256. Samish Bay Cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211. Neurovista Corporation</td>
<td>258. SCOLR Pharma, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212. Nonprofits Unlimited</td>
<td>259. Scott Leach Orchards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216. Ojoba Collective</td>
<td>263. Skin Biology, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218. Onconome, Inc.</td>
<td>265. Sound Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220. Otte Farm, George and Apple Otte</td>
<td>267. Spencer Technologies, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222. Paccar</td>
<td>269. Starbucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223. Pacific Biometrics, Inc.</td>
<td>270. Stecher Proprietary Interests, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224. Pacific Bioscience Laboratories</td>
<td>271. Sunny Pine Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225. Pacific Market International</td>
<td>272. Sustainable Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory</td>
<td>274. Targeted Genetics Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228. Paloma Pottery</td>
<td>275. Therus Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229. Parsons Public Relations</td>
<td>276. T-Mobile USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230. Pathway Medical Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>277. Traditions Cafe &amp; World Folk Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231. Pavidia Farms</td>
<td>278. Trubion Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Tully's Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Ultreo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Uptake Medical Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Urban Visions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Vashon Organics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>VentiPoint, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>VisionGate, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Vital Choice Seafood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>VizX Labs, maker of GeneSifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>VLST Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Washington Biodiesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Weyerhaeuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Williamson Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>XactaGen, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>ZymoGenetics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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