



providing additional data and reviewing and contributing to the text of the article.

Human Participant Protection

Because no human participants were involved in this study, no protocol approval was needed.

References

1. Turnock BJ. *Public Health: What It Is and How It Works*. 3rd ed. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers; 2004.
2. Moulton AD, Halverson PK, Honoré PA, Berkowitz B. Public health finance: a conceptual framework. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2004;10(5):377–382.
3. Novick LF, Morrow CB, Mays GP. *Public Health Administration: Principles for Population-Based Management*. 2nd ed. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers; 2008.
4. Groves SA, Valente MG. *Evaluating Financial Condition: A Handbook for Local Government*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: ICMA Press; 2003.
5. Getzen TE. Advancing public health finance. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2007;13(2):225–226.
6. Honoré PA, Clarke RL, Mead DM, Menditto SM. Creating financial transparency in public health: examining best practices of system partners. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2007;13(2):121–129.
7. Lusthaus C, Adrien MH, Anderson G, Carden F, Montalvan GP. *Organizational Assessment: A Framework for Improving Performance*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: International Development Research Centre; 2002.
8. Moore M, Brown L, Honan J. Toward a public value framework for accountability and performance management for international non-governmental organizations. Paper presented at: Hauser Center/Keio University Workshop on Accountability for International Non-Governmental Organizations, November 2001, Cambridge, MA.
9. Lafond A, Brown L. *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity Building in the Health Sector in Developing Countries*. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; 2003.
10. Ingraham PW, Joyce P, Donahue AK. *Government Performance: Why Management Matters*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press; 2003.
11. Polidano C. Measuring public sector capacity. *World Dev*. 2000;28(5):805–822.
12. Eisinger P. Organizational capacity and organizational effectiveness among street-level food assistance programs. *Nonprofit Volunteer Sector Q*. 2002;31(1):115–130.
13. Connolly P, Lukas C. *Strengthening Nonprofit Performance: A Funder's Guide to Capacity Building*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst Wilder Foundation; 2002.
14. Letts C, Ryan WP, Grossman A. *High Performance Nonprofit Organizations: Managing Upstream for Greater Impact*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc; 1999.
15. Finkler S, Kovner C. *Financial Management for Nurse Managers and Executives*. Philadelphia, PA: WB Saunders Co; 2003.
16. McLaughlin CP, Kaluzny AD. *Continuous Quality Improvement in Health Care*. 3rd ed. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers; 2006.
17. Khan MY, Jain PK. *Management Accounting: Text, Problems, and Cases*. 4th ed. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw-Hill; 2007.
18. Finkler S, Ward D. *Accounting Fundamentals for Healthcare Management*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers; 2006.
19. Butrie AM, Coakley D, Graves B. Productivity improvement: Catholic Health East reaps rewards. *Healthc Financ Manage*. 2008;62(7):82–85.
20. Cleverley WO, Cleverley JO. Scorecards and dashboards: using financial metrics to improve performance. *Healthc Financ Manage*. 2005;59(7):64–69.
21. Coyne J, Singh S. The early indicators of financial failure: a study of bankrupt and solvent health systems. *J Healthc Manage*. 2008;53(5):333–345.
22. Kloha P, Weissert C, Kleine R. Developing and testing a composite model to predict local fiscal distress. *Public Adm Rev*. 2005;65(3):313–323.
23. Langabeer J. Predicting financial distress in teaching hospitals. *J Health Care Finance*. 2006;33(1):84–92.
24. Langabeer J. The fallacy of financial heuristics. *J Health Care Finance*. 2007;34(2):81–88.
25. Love D, Revere L, Black K. A current look at the key performance measures considered critical by health care leaders. *J Health Care Finance*. 2008;34(3):19–33.
26. McCracken M, McIlwain T, Fottler M. Measuring organizational performance in the hospital industry: an exploratory comparison of objective and subjective methods. *Health Serv Manage Res*. 2001;14:211–219.
27. Meliones JN, Ballard R, Liekweg R, Burton W. No mission, no margin: it's that simple. *J Health Care Finance*. 2001;27(3):21–29.
28. Petro J. Fiscal indicator reports and ratio analysis: benchmarking Ohio municipalities and school districts. *Gov Financ Rev*. 1998;14(5):17.
29. Pink G, Holmes G, D'Alpe C, Strunk LA, McGee P, Sliifkin R. Financial indicators for critical access hospitals. *J Rural Health*. 2006;22(3):229–236.
30. Pink G, Holmes G, Thompson E, Sliifkin R. Variations in financial performance among peer groups of critical access hospitals. *J Rural Health*. 2007;23(4):299–305.
31. Schuhmann TM. Hospital financial performance: trends to watch. *Healthc Financ Manage*. 2008;62(7):58–66.
32. *Gaps in Hospital Capitalization Are Widening in Maryland*. Baltimore, MD: Sage Policy Group; 2006.
33. Lesneski C. Public health finance—evaluating financial condition. Available at: http://www.ncpublichealthacademy.org/phfinance_handout.pdf. Accessed November 9, 2010.
34. Honoré P, Lesneski C, Zelman WN. Financial ratio analysis. Available at: <http://www.publichealthsystems.org/phf/1475/FinancialRatioAnalysis>. Accessed November 9, 2010.
35. Berne R, Schramm R. *The Financial Analysis of Governments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1986.

Advancing Public Health Obesity Policy Through State Attorneys General

Jennifer L. Pomeranz, JD, MPH, and Kelly D. Brownell, PhD

Obesity in the United States exacts a heavy health and financial toll, requiring new approaches to address this public health crisis. State attorneys general have been underutilized in efforts to formulate and implement food and obesity policy solutions. Their authority

lies at the intersection of law and public policy, creating unique opportunities unavailable to other officials and government entities.

Attorneys general have a broad range of authority over matters specifically relevant to obesity and nutrition policy,

including *parens patriae* (parent of the country) authority, protecting consumer interests, enacting and supporting rules and regulations, working together across states, engaging in consumer education, and drafting opinions and amicus briefs.

Significant room exists for greater attorney general involvement in formulating and championing solutions to public health problems such as obesity. (*Am J Public Health*. 2011;101:425–431. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2010.198697)



OBESITY IS A PUBLIC HEALTH crisis that requires government action at multiple levels and across disciplines. Approximately two thirds of the US adult population¹ and one third of children and adolescents² are overweight or obese. This problem exacts a heavy health and financial toll,³ requiring new approaches toward a solution. Many state and local legislatures and agencies are addressing obesity and food policy, but other public officials could play an important role.

State attorneys general have a scope of authority that lies at the intersection of law and public policy, creating unique opportunities that may not be available to other government officials. Attorneys general are independent public officials responsible for justice, protecting the public interest, counseling public officials, and serving as a liaison among states and between state and federal entities. Thus, state attorneys general can be leaders in formulating and effectuating obesity and food policy solutions.

AUTHORITY OF STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL

There are 51 state attorneys general (including the District of Columbia) and 5 territorial attorneys general. These officials possess a broad range of power over a wide variety of state and local matters. In 43 states the attorney general is elected; in the remaining jurisdictions the position is appointed by the governor, legislature, or state supreme

court.⁴ An attorney general is both the chief legal advisor to the state government and the state's chief law enforcement officer.

Attorneys general represent the interests of many clients, including the state as an entity, state officials in their official capacity, state agencies and branches of government, and the public. Although their authority varies according to the state's statutory and constitutional mandates, their powers are quite broad and generally include the authority to enforce state and some federal laws, handle or supervise criminal prosecutions, act as public advocates in areas such as antitrust enforcement and consumer protection, propose legislation, institute civil suits on behalf of the state, represent the public's interests, issue formal opinions, and represent the state in court.⁵

State attorneys general can use their authority to make a significant contribution to public health. Attorneys general were the major initiators of and actors in the landmark US tobacco litigation and ensuing master settlement agreement⁶; however, both before and since the tobacco litigation, attorneys general have played an important role in public health matters. In the early 1900s, attorneys general brought a series of cases across the states to successfully enjoin the activities of polluters.⁷ More recently, attorneys general have initiated investigations into misleading and deceptive labeling of food⁸ and beverage products,⁹ and they have brought lawsuits against pharmaceutical¹⁰ and food companies¹¹ to protect the public from dangerous products.

Through such individual and coordinated actions, attorneys general can and often do bring issues into the national spotlight in ways that prompt, support, or coincide with actions by federal officials. For example, in 2009 the Connecticut attorney general's investigation into the food industry's Smart Choices Program, which labeled questionable processed foods as healthy,⁸ occurred shortly before the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) initiated its own investigation into the program.¹² The combination of the 2 actions prompted the food companies to shut down the program.¹³ Attorneys general can also support federal initiatives and work directly with Congress and federal agencies.

Because of their prominence, attorneys general can use their bully pulpit to bring media and public attention to important issues that might otherwise be overlooked. Additionally, attorneys general regularly interact with nongovernmental organizations, local officials, and government entities both inside and outside their states. Attorneys general can encourage these groups to view public health as a priority area and can provide the legal foundation for doing so.

ATTORNEYS GENERAL CAN CHAMPION NUTRITION POLICY

Attorneys general can play an integral role in the advancement of food and obesity policy by utilizing specific authorities available to them. The major relevant tools of attorneys general include

the following: acting under their *parens patriae* (parent of the country) authority, protecting consumer interests, enacting or supporting rules and regulations, working together across the states, engaging in consumer education, and drafting opinions and amicus briefs.

Parens Patriae

The common-law doctrine of *parens patriae* forms the basis of the philosophy that permeates the offices of every attorney general. Although limited by specific statutes in many states, *parens patriae* places upon each attorney general the responsibility to represent the state's interests, in general, and the state's interest "in the well-being of its populace" in particular.^{7(p602)}

Parens patriae confers on states the ability to vindicate quasi-sovereign interests, which include "the health and well-being—both physical and economic—of its residents" and the state's "interest in not being discriminatorily denied its rightful status within the federal system."^{7(p600,602)}

Parens patriae can serve as the basis for litigation when an attorney general believes that a party's behavior adversely affects a substantial number of the state's citizens.¹⁴ Through an action filed by an attorney general, a state may seek declaratory relief or recover costs or damages incurred by behavior that threatens the health, safety, or welfare of the state's citizenry.¹⁴ Through this authority, attorneys general can redress wrongs when other remedies are lacking and can act to protect public interests in areas where other parties cannot.



Attorneys general used their *parens patriae* authority as part of their legal theories in the tobacco litigation. Through these lawsuits, the states sought reimbursement for the cost of medical care, including Medicaid, incurred for treating consumers with smoking-related illnesses.¹⁵ As experts in their states' laws, the attorneys general had a strong and valid basis for using *parens patriae* authority to seek recovery of tobacco-related costs. The states developed their *parens patriae* theories to varying degrees throughout the litigation, but because the master settlement agreement terminated the lawsuits, none of the theories were fully tested in court.¹⁵

The cost of obesity for state and local economies is similarly imposing. In 2008, US medical costs related to obesity were estimated to be \$147 billion per year.¹⁶ Additionally, indirect costs such as absenteeism, disability, and workers' compensation directly involve economic interests within the states.¹⁷ As scientific advances and legal bases related to obesity continue to be more fully developed, *parens patriae* may be increasingly well suited to address the public health issues caused by products manufactured and marketed by industry.

Consumer Protection

Attorneys general are tasked with enforcing the states' civil laws. Every state and the District of Columbia have statutes that make it unlawful for businesses to engage in unfair and deceptive acts and practices (UDAP). Attorneys general often pursue consumer protection litigation when

a company violates citizens' rights. UDAP statutes vary substantively and procedurally by jurisdiction, but all are designed to protect consumers and the public interest; therefore, they allow attorneys general to obtain penalties or injunctions against violators for that purpose.¹⁸ Many UDAP statutes are patterned after the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act, and some states require that judicial interpretation of the FTC Act apply to the state's statute.¹⁸ The authority of the attorneys general to pursue consumer protection actions includes prelitigation powers, such as moving for restraining orders, subpoenaing documents and investigating company practices to obtain information such as the nature of the company's business and advertising practices, and guidance given to employees.

The most direct way in which attorneys general can utilize their litigation authority to address food and obesity issues is through their charge to protect consumers. In the food arena, particular marketing campaigns may fall directly within UDAP prohibitions. For example, in 2009 a children's cereal promotion encouraged children to continuously play games on the company's Web site for a chance to win cash prizes every 10 minutes.¹⁹ Once a child provided his or her name, e-mail address, parent's e-mail address, and a password to the Web site, the child was registered for the games. Then the parent received an e-mail stating that the information provided by the child would "only be used for the purpose of fulfilling a prize"; however, the child received e-mails purporting to be

from an animated spokes-character, reminding the child that "there is a chance to win \$5 every ten minutes!" and that they should "[c]ome back to play again—up to 10 times a day!" by logging onto the Web site (<http://GeneralMills@eprizepromotions.com>, computer-generated communication, July 2009).

The Supreme Court has found that a lottery or gambling tactic that "encourages gambling among children" to induce sales of a product "exploit[s] consumers, children, who are unable to protect themselves."²⁰(p307–308) The Court previously upheld the FTC's finding that such a practice was an unfair method of competition within the meaning of the FTC Act.²⁰ (This case was decided before Congress granted the FTC jurisdiction over deceptive acts and practices.) Acts and practices such as this one could likely qualify as unfair and deceptive under states' UDAP statutes, and many attorneys general would be within their jurisdiction to bring such a claim under their authority to address such practices.²¹

Rulemaking

In most states, attorneys general have the authority to draft rules and regulations pursuant to their UDAP jurisdiction.¹⁸ Rulemaking is appropriate to address a widespread industry practice when litigation against a single entity will not abate the threat to the public. The rulemaking procedures of most states are similar to the one specified in the Administrative Procedures Act,²² which requires a public comment period. This procedure allows the attorneys

general to learn the perspectives of both the businesses they seek to regulate and the public they seek to protect.

Although infrequently, attorneys general have drafted, promulgated, and successfully implemented a broad variety of UDAP regulations across the states.¹⁸ Regulations have included requiring factual disclosures, restricting methods of solicitation,¹⁸ and regulating conduct more directly to protect public health. For example, in Massachusetts, the attorney general utilized his UDAP regulatory authority²³ to promulgate regulations to protect citizens from public health threats such as unsafe handguns²⁴ and self-service displays of tobacco products.²⁵

Even if attorneys general are reluctant to use their own rulemaking power, they can be influential in the promulgation of rules and regulations by their client agencies, such as the state health department.²⁶ Attorneys general can assist in drafting and advocating for rules proposed by state agencies. Similarly, attorneys general can participate in federal rulemaking. During the notice and comment period, the attorney general can submit his or her own comment on a promising public health regulation or provide input on a comment drafted by the public health community and circulate it among like-minded attorneys general. This represents an opportunity for multistate participation in federal rulemaking. Advocates can urge their attorneys general to support proposed measures by federal agencies that could have a positive effect on food and obesity policy.



Multistate Action

Attorneys general frequently work together across state lines through multistate litigation and advocacy, and they can also pursue multistate rulemaking. Multistate activity helps set national policy for the benefit of the public. For example, 29 attorneys general sent a letter of remonstrance to the manufacturer of caffeinated alcohol beverages,²⁷ and 18 of the attorneys general followed up with a letter to the FDA urging federal action on the issue.²⁸ Such coordinated advocacy brings issues to the national forum and helps change policy for consumers nationwide.

During multistate litigation, coordination among states puts pressure on defendants to settle with as many states as possible, which can produce more uniform and equitable outcomes for the states and their citizens. Attorneys general may choose to coordinate across states if a company's actions are deemed to threaten the health and safety of a broad range of citizens. Attorneys general can also seek injunctive relief to reform poor practices and monetary relief (costs or damages) when citizens or the state's finances have been damaged.

The tobacco litigation is a prominent example of multistate legal activity. Much has been written about the similarities and differences between the tobacco and food industries and between tobacco and food as substances²⁹; however, the comparisons drawn in terms of potential litigation strategies for the future are meant to illuminate the power attorneys general have over problematic practices, rather than to compare

the products and industries themselves. The Minnesota attorney general's unprecedented effort to obtain previously undiscovered industry documents exposing decades of deception was critical to the success of the tobacco litigation.³⁰ Although similar documents may not exist in the food arena, the tobacco discovery reveals the benefits of attorney general involvement in litigation aimed at addressing public health problems that may stem from industry activity.

During the tobacco litigation, states argued that the industry manipulated nicotine content to cause addiction, misled residents about the dangers of smoking, and targeted children, adolescents, and African Americans.³¹ Similar theories might apply in the food and obesity area. First, emerging research reveals that certain properties of food may be particularly addictive, and concerns have been raised about the potential manipulation of these properties to induce addictive responses and consequent overconsumption of these foods.^{32,33} This area may prove fruitful for attorney general involvement as the scientific evidence coalesces.³⁴

In terms of marketing, certain companies specifically target children, adolescents, and racial/ethnic groups with marketing techniques that may be considered unfair and deceptive.^{35,36} Food and beverage companies have been shown to exploit children's psychological vulnerabilities in their campaigns^{37,38} to market the most unhealthy products to children and adolescents.^{39–41} Many of these tactics may violate states' UDAP statutes.⁴²

Marketing in schools is especially problematic because it occurs within an educational context and can imply endorsement by the school. One marketer explained that school advertising

can be very effective, reaching a captive audience with little competition for students' attention. . . . [S]chool campaigns have to earn the approval of local administrators, and that serves as something of an endorsement, whether intended or not. . . . Also, much of school advertising has an educational element to it, [such as] a poster celebrating Black History Month provided by the advertiser. That makes it seem less like advertising.⁴³

Marketing of unhealthy products in schools⁴⁴ can be seen as competing with the pedagogical aims of both health and physical education and with educational attainment overall.^{45,46}

Certain racial/ethnic groups are also disproportionately targeted by particular companies promoting their most calorie-dense, nutrient-poor foods and beverages. This marketing disparity is present in magazines,⁴⁷ on billboards,⁴⁷ on television,⁴⁸ and in retail outlets.⁴⁸

Because all such targeted marketing occurs across state lines, attorneys general could coordinate their efforts to address potential exploitation. Coordinated actions across states could encourage companies to discontinue their worst practices and work with attorneys general to modify future practices.

Another area that may merit multistate action is the matter of privacy concerns on the Internet. Food and beverage companies use

Web site tracking and analytics to target marketing efforts toward individual Internet users, including children. Many companies ask for information such as e-mail addresses, cell phone numbers, and zip code, and they often share this information with third parties. Privacy protection is increasingly of concern in the United States, so any attempt to obtain personal information from children and to use that information to target marketing toward them is particularly alarming.⁴⁹ A recent survey found that two thirds of Americans object to online tracking⁵⁰; hence, there would likely be public support for attorney general intervention.

Consumer Education

Attorneys general engage in consumer education initiatives that are highly publicized and can have a positive impact. Attorneys general disseminate information about deceptive, misleading, or fraudulent practices so consumers can protect themselves.⁵¹ Consumer education can include both practices exposed by the attorneys general themselves and those brought to light by federal agencies such as the FTC and the FDA. Attorneys general also seek to educate consumers about their rights and interests so consumers can make informed decisions in the marketplace.⁵²

Recently, the National Association of Attorneys General teamed up with the FTC and other federal, state, and local government agencies and consumer advocacy organizations to support a coordinated campaign intended to educate consumers on topics including fraud, identity theft, and money



management.⁵³ The issues discussed above (i.e., privacy protection and targeted marketing of nutrient-poor foods and beverages) could be topics for future education campaigns.

The attorneys general also have the power to convene meetings and initiate projects to protect and educate consumers. For example, in February 2010 the attorney general of Vermont created an obesity initiative to identify and develop potential actions to reduce obesity in Vermont, complementing similar work being done by the state departments of health and education.⁵⁴ Through this initiative, working groups were founded to address such topics as obesity and land use, retail environments, and children and families. The groups issued a final report in late 2010 on the current landscape of the state's progress, recommendations from the groups on how to improve obesity in Vermont, and economic and legal analysis pertinent to the recommendations.

Opinions

Attorneys general can issue formal written opinions to answer questions of law posed by state agencies and officials. Such opinions generally address questions pertaining to an agency or official's legal duties, ambiguities of the law, questions of legality in advance of the passage of a law, or answers to questions where the law is clear but the outcome is unpopular, to protect the agency or official who must carry out the law's intent.⁵⁵ The legal effect of formal opinions varies from state to state, but government officials can use this assistance when confronted with questions of

legality while enacting public health policies. Through these opinions, the attorneys general can provide the legal foundation for responses to questions pertaining to anything from the legality of taxing calorically sweetened beverages^{56,57} to addressing social determinants of health,^{58,59} and these opinions can help support legislative or regulatory efforts on this front.

Beyond formal opinions, state and federal policymakers regularly solicit the views and opinions of attorneys general. This bully-pulpit power can be critical to the success of policy initiatives championed by these officials. Attorneys general are active players in their state legislatures and can testify or advocate for and against bills pending in the legislature. When health-related legislation is proposed, the public health community should encourage their attorneys general to participate on the side of public health throughout the process.

Amicus Briefs

An amicus (friend of the court) brief helps courts decide cases by offering for their consideration interests and perspectives that are not necessarily presented by the parties but that arise out of the facts of the case and that are crucial to the outcome of the litigation. In the context of litigation, state attorneys general have the right to file amicus briefs in the US Supreme Court⁶⁰ and in federal courts of appeal.⁶¹ No similar provision exists in the federal district courts, and the rules of state courts vary, but for a judge not to accept an amicus brief from a state attorney general would be rare. Acceptance of an amicus brief

is even more likely in state court in which the state is not already a party.

The ability of an attorney general to weigh in on litigation on behalf of the public's interest is an important power. Changes in our country's food and obesity policy have already resulted in litigation. The voice of an attorney general could be important or decisive to the outcome of future lawsuits. It is thus beneficial for public health groups to enlist the support of attorneys general in such litigation and for the advancement of food and obesity legislation, regulation, and policy initiatives in their communities.

CONCLUSIONS

Attorneys general have a broad and impressive range of authority over matters specifically relevant to obesity and food policy. The public health crisis of obesity can only be reversed with concerted efforts among multiple levels of government, across states, and including stakeholders and local organizations.

Attorneys general have a significant role to play on the basis of their legal authority and their status within their states, among all the states, and relative to the federal government. Although attorney general engagement with the issue of obesity has begun, there is much room for greater attorney general involvement in formulating and championing solutions to this public health problem. Obesity may not be on the radar of every attorney general as a topic for their attention, so state and local advocates

should contact and work with their attorneys general to support public health measures at every level.

Like other officials who are elected or who answer to an elected official, attorneys general may face political constraints. However, the health and financial toll of obesity affects all states and should motivate attorneys general to get involved and even lead the charge in this area. Attorneys general should explore the boundaries of their authority to ensure that they play the most constructive role possible. ■

About the Authors

Jennifer L. Pomeranz and Kelly D. Brownell are with the Yale Rudd Center for Food Policy & Obesity, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Correspondence should be sent to Jennifer L. Pomeranz, Yale Rudd Center for Food Policy & Obesity, Yale University, 309 Edwards St, PO Box 208369, New Haven, CT 06520-8369 (e-mail: jennifer.pomeranz@yale.edu). Reprints can be ordered at <http://www.ajph.org> by clicking the "Reprints/Eprints" link.

This article was accepted June 20, 2010.

Contributors

Both authors conceptualized the article. J.L. Pomeranz was the primary researcher and writer, and K.D. Brownell was the secondary writer.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank James E. Tierney and Cindy M. Lott of the National State Attorneys General Program at Columbia Law School for their partnership, intellectual contribution, and comments on previous drafts of the article.

Human Participant Protection

No study protocol approval was required because no human participants were involved.

References

1. Flegal KM, Carroll MD, Ogden CL, Curtin LR. Prevalence and trends in



- obesity among US adults, 1999–2008. *JAMA*. 2010;303(3):235–241.
2. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Flegal KM. High body mass index for age among US children and adolescents, 2003–2006. *JAMA*. 2008;299(20):2401–2405.
3. Study estimates medical cost of obesity may be as high as \$147 billion annually [press release]. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; July 27, 2009. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/media/pressrel/2009/r090727.htm>. Accessed March 3, 2010.
4. National Association of Attorneys General. How does one become an attorney general? Available at: http://www.naag.org/how_does_one_become_an_attorney_general.php. Accessed March 8, 2010.
5. National Association of Attorneys General. What does an attorney general do? Available at: http://www.naag.org/what_does_an_attorney_general_do.php. Accessed January 12, 2010.
6. Pertschuk M. *Smoke in Their Eyes: Lessons in Movement Leadership From the Tobacco Wars*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press; 2001.
7. *Alfred L. Snap & Son, Inc v Puerto Rico*, 458 US 592, 603 (1982).
8. Neuman W. Connecticut to scrutinize food labels. *New York Times*. October 14, 2009. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/15/us/15food.html?_r=1&emc=eta1. Accessed January 5, 2010.
9. Attorney general, DCP commissioner announce agreement banishing “cocaine” drink from CT stores [press release]. Hartford, CT: Office of the Attorney General; May 7, 2007. Available at: <http://www.ct.gov/AG/cwp/view.asp?A=2788&Q=379504>. Accessed February 27, 2010.
10. Russell L. State of Montana settles lawsuit with pharmaceutical giant Eli Lilly for \$13 million. *Bozeman Daily Chronicle*. February 25, 2010. Available at: http://www.bozemandailychronicle.com/news/article_a0448f7e-1624-59c7-857d-da45e1ed4890.html. Accessed February 27, 2010.
11. Rizo C. Potato chip and french fry makers settle with attorney general. *Legal Newsline*. August 2, 2008. Available at: <http://www.legalnewsline.com/news/214550-potato-chip-and-french-fry-makers-settle-with-attorney-general>. Accessed January 11, 2011.
12. Lukovitz K. FDA scrutinizing nutrition labeling systems. *Marketing Daily*. October 21, 2009. Available at: http://www.mediapost.com/publications/?fa=Articles.showArticle&art_aid=115820. Accessed January 5, 2010.
13. Gallagher J. Companies to discontinue Smart Choices. *Supermarket News*. October 29, 2009. Available at: http://supermarketnews.com/news/smart_choices_1029. Accessed January 13, 2010.
14. Ieyoub RP, Eisenberg T. State attorney general actions, the tobacco litigation, and the doctrine of *parens patriae*. *Tulane Law Rev*. 2000;74(5–6):1859–1884.
15. Janofsky M. Mississippi seeks damages from tobacco companies. *New York Times*. May 24, 1994. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/05/24/us/mississippi-seeks-damages-from-tobacco-companies.html>. Accessed January 15, 2010.
16. Finkelstein EA, Trogdon JG, Cohen JW, Dietz W. Annual medical spending attributable to obesity: payer- and service-specific estimates. *Health Aff*. 2009;28(5):w822–w831.
17. Trogdon JG, Finkelstein EA, Hylands T, Dellea PS, Kamal-Bahl SJ. Indirect costs of obesity: a review of the current literature. *Obes Rev*. 2008;9(5):489–500.
18. Kaplan G, Smith CB. Patching the holes in the consumer product safety net: using state unfair practices laws to make handguns and other consumer goods safer. *Yale J Regul*. 2000;17(2):253–325.
19. General Mills. Honey Defender Web site. Available at: <http://www.honeydefender.millsberry.com>. Accessed January 5, 2010.
20. *FTC v RF Keppel & Bros, Inc*, 291 US 304, 307–308 (1934).
21. Hessel E. Making Facebook pay. *Forbes*. July 6, 2009. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/2009/07/06/facebook-internet-advertising-business-media-facebook.html>. Accessed January 15, 2010.
22. Administrative Procedures Act, 5 USC §553 (1966).
23. Massachusetts Gen. Laws ch. 93A § 2(c).
24. *American Shooting Sports Council, Inc v Attorney General*, 429 Mass 871, 871–872 (1999).
25. *Lorillard v Reilly*, 533 US 525 (2001).
26. Pomeranz J. The unique authority of state and local health departments to address obesity. *Am J Public Health*. In press.
27. A communication from the chief legal officers of the following states [29 states listed]. Connecticut Attorney General Web site. Available at: <http://www.ct.gov/ag/lib/ag/children/attorneysgenerallettertoanheuserbuschrealcoholenergydrinks.pdf>. Published May 10, 2007. Accessed January 9, 2010.
28. Zhang J. Caffeine, alcohol drinks targeted. *Wall Street Journal*. November 14, 2009. Available at: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125816088527947933.html>. Accessed January 9, 2010.
29. Brownell KD, Warner KE. The perils of ignoring history: big tobacco played dirty and millions died. How similar is big food? *Milbank Q*. 2009;87(1):259–294.
30. Ciresi MV, Walburn RB, Sutton TD. Decades of deceit: document discovery in the Minnesota tobacco litigation. *William Mitchell Law Rev*. 1999;25:477.
31. *Broselow et al v Attorney General, et al*, 319 F.3d 605, 610 (3rd Cir. 2003).
32. Gearhardt AN, Corbin WR, Brownell KD. Food addiction: an examination of the diagnostic criteria for dependence. *J Addict Med*. 2009;3(1):1–7.
33. Brownell KD, Gold M, eds. *Handbook of Food and Addiction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. In press.
34. Pomeranz JL, Teret SP, Sugarman SD, Rutkow L, Brownell KD. Innovative legal approaches to address obesity. *Milbank Q*. 2009;87(1):185–213.
35. Institute of Medicine. *Food Marketing to Children and Youth*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006.
36. Pomeranz JL. Television food marketing to children revisited: the Federal Trade Commission has the constitutional and statutory authority to regulate. *J Law Med Ethics*. 2010;38(1):98–116.
37. Harris JL, Pomeranz JL, Lobstein T, Brownell KB. A crisis in the marketplace: how food marketing contributes to childhood obesity and what can be done. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2009;30:211–225.
38. Kunkel D, Wilcox BL, Cantor J, Palmer E, Linn S, Dowrick P. Psychological issues in the increasing commercialization of childhood. In: *Report of the APA Task Force on Advertising and Children*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2004:20–54.
39. Rudd Center for Food Policy & Obesity. Cereal F.A.C.T.S. Web site. Available at: <http://www.cerealfacts.org>. Accessed January 12, 2010.
40. Story M, French S. Food advertising and marketing directed at children and adolescents in the US. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2004;1(1):3.
41. Montgomery KC, Chester J. Interactive food and beverage marketing: targeting adolescents in the digital age. *J Adolescent Health*. 2009;45(suppl 3):S18–S29.
42. *Committee on Children's Television, Inc v General Foods Corp*, 35 Cal3d 197 (1983).
43. Vasquez D. Your client's ad in public schools. *Media Life*. January 20, 2009. Available at: http://www.medialifemagazine.com/artman2/publish/Out_of_Home_19/Your_client_s_ad_in_public_schools.asp. Accessed November 10, 2010.
44. Molnar A, Garcia DR, Boninger F, Merrill B. Marketing of foods of minimal nutritional value to children in schools. *Prev Med*. 2008;47(5):504–507.
45. *Planned Parenthood of Southern Nevada v Clark County School District*, 941 F.2d 817, 827 (9th Cir. 1991).
46. Institute of Medicine. Food marketing to children and youth: threat or opportunity? Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006.
47. Yancey AK, Cole BL, Brown R, et al. A cross-sectional prevalence study of ethnically targeted and general audience outdoor obesity-related advertising. *Milbank Q*. 2009;87(1):155–184.
48. Grier SA, Kumanyika SK. The context for choice: health implications of targeted food and beverage marketing to African Americans. *Am J Public Health*. 2008;98(9):1616–1629.
49. An Act To Protect Minors from Pharmaceutical Marketing Practices. State of Maine Legislature Web site. Available at: <http://www.mainelegislature.org/LawMakerWeb/summary.asp?ID=280035235>. Published March 29, 2010. Accessed November 11, 2010.
50. Clifford S. Two-thirds of Americans object to online tracking. *New York Times*. September 29, 2009. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/30/business/media/30adco.html>. Accessed November 11, 2010.
51. Pennsylvania attorney general. Bureau of Consumer Protection Web site.



Available at: <http://www.attorneygeneral.gov/consumers.aspx?id=255>. Accessed February 23, 2010.

52. Nevada attorney general. Bureau of Consumer Protection Web site. Available at: <http://ag.state.nv.us/org/bcp/bcp.htm>. Accessed February 23, 2010.

53. National Consumer Protection Week Web site. Available at: <http://consumer.gov/ncpw/about>. Accessed March 2, 2010.

54. Office of the Attorney General, State of Vermont. Attorney general's obesity initiative. Available at: <http://www.atg.state.vt.us/issues/consumer-protection/obesity.php>. Accessed April 7, 2010.

55. Attorney general of Texas. Cumulative subject master index AG opinions 1990–present. Available at: http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opin/opinions_headings.php. Accessed January 15, 2010.

56. Brownell KD, Farley T, Willett WC, et al. The public health and economic benefits of taxing sugar-sweetened beverages. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361(16):1599–1605.

57. Brownell KD, Frieden KR. Ounces of prevention—the public policy case for taxes on sugared beverages. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(18):1805–1808.

58. Black JL, Macinko J. The changing distribution and determinants of obesity in the neighborhoods of New York City,

2003–2007. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2010; 171(7):765–775.

59. Amarasinghe A, D'Souza G, Brown C, Oh H, Borisova T. The influence of socioeconomic and environmental determinants on health and obesity: a West Virginia case study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2009;6(8):2271–2287.

60. Sup. Ct. R. 37.

61. Fed. R. App. P. 29(a).

Enacting Sustainable School-Based Health Initiatives: A Communication-Centered Approach to Policy and Practice

Marianne LeGreco, PhD, and Heather E. Canary, PhD

Communication plays an important role in all aspects of the development and use of policy. We present a communication-centered perspective on the processes of enacting public health policies.

Our proposed conceptual framework comprises 4 communication frames: orientation, amplification, implementation, and integration. Empirical examples from 2 longitudinal studies of school-based health policies show how each frame includes different communication processes that enable sustainable public health policy practices in school-based health initiatives. These 4 frames provide unique insight into the capacity of school-based public health policy to engage youths, parents, and a broader community of stakeholders.

Communication is often included as an element of health policy; however, our framework demonstrates the importance of communication as a pivotal resource in sustaining

changes in public health practices. (*Am J Public Health*. 2011;101:431–437. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.186858)

THE STUDY OF PUBLIC

health policy often reaches across disciplines and contexts.¹ Recent articles in the *American Journal of Public Health*, for instance, have demonstrated the relevance of communication to health policy issues. These essays have situated communication within the processes of policymaking,² and they have focused on issues of advocacy, ethics, and community participation.^{3–5} However, this body of work lacks explicit statements detailing how communication helps translate policies into practices. Communication plays an important role in all aspects of the development and use of policy. Perhaps most important, communication grants insight into the process of enacting policy texts in everyday practice.^{6,7} Accordingly, we present

here a communication-centered perspective on public health policy.

To examine the relationship between communication and public health policy, we concentrated on school-based health initiatives because these efforts provide intriguing contexts for studying the relationship between policy and communication, particularly because the relevant concepts relate to processes and practices of change. In addition, public health policies are more than static sets of rules; they can also serve as new resources for coordinating change across schools. These resources may give a variety of stakeholders the opportunity to secure rights and promote sustainable changes within those schools.

ENACTING PUBLIC HEALTH POLICY THROUGH COMMUNICATION

Attempts to examine communication, enactment, and health

policy are made more difficult by the ubiquity and ambiguity of these terms. To clarify these opaque concepts, we used structuration theory⁸ to focus on the use of rules and resources, such as policies, to enact changes in systems of practice, such as school-based health initiatives.

Positioning Policy Communication

Structuration theory offers a useful way to examine how individuals and institutions might use policy to institute new routines. More specifically, this theory presents the possibility of defining policies as rules and resources. Policies are rules in that they both proscribe and prescribe actions, but policies also are resources in that they serve as means for accomplishing specific goals (e.g., conducting health screenings in schools).^{6,9} As such, policies operate as texts, decisions, and practices that provide documented postures for routine actions.^{9,10}