



Sustainability Committee Meeting
Thursday, June 22, 2023
City Hall Council Chambers – 601 Main St W. Ashland, WI 54806
6:00 PM

Take notice that a meeting of the Sustainability Committee will be held in- person in the City Hall Council Chambers, with the availability to attend virtually.

To join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone: <https://meet.goto.com/740241965>. Or dial in using your phone. United States (Toll Free): 1 866 899 4679 Access Code: 740-241-965

The following items will be considered:

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. Approval of minutes from the May 25, 2023 Meeting

3. Citizen Participation Period

4. Projects/Discussions

- a. Waste and Recycling
 - i. June 3rd Ashland Spring Clean Up - Update
 - ii. June 20th Cleansweeps Event - Update
- b. Climate Change
 - i. 25x25 Plan further discussion
- c. Water
 - i. Develop Sourcewater Protection Plan initial Recommendations
- d. Annual Report for City Council
- e. Solar Incentives Proposal
- f. Complete Streets
 - i. Discussion
- g. Green Tier Legacy Communities
 - i. Update and Annual Report Discussion
- h. Great Lakes Friendly Restaurant Certification
 - i. Discussion
- i. Seed Mix
 - i. Discussion



j. Community Garden Update

5. Items of Interest for Future Meetings

6. Adjournment

The City of Ashland does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, creed, color, national origin, sexual orientation, age or disability in employment or provision of services, programs or activities.

NOTE: Upon reasonable notice, the City of Ashland will accommodate the needs of disabled individuals or individuals with limited English proficiency through auxiliary aids or services. For additional information or to request this service, contact the Planning & Zoning Department at 715-682-7041 (not a TDD telephone number)

City of Ashland – Sustainability Committee Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 25th, 2023

6:00 pm – 7:00 pm HYBRID MEETING:

Meeting Link: <https://meet.goto.com/159211365> | Access Code:
159-211-365 - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS (601 Main Street W)

Energy Action Plan, 25x25 Plan, Sourcewater Protection Plan linked here:
<https://sites.google.com/view/ashland-sustainability/themes>

Present: Laura Graf, Lissa Radke, Amy Amman, Axel Peterman, Adam Zais

Excused: Kate Ullman, Dale Kupczyk,

Agenda

- 1) Approval of Agenda
Peterman called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm. Amman moved and Zais seconded. The Committee voted to approve the agenda as proposed. Mr. Peterman acknowledged Mr. Wiley's assistance as staff person and thanked him for his help.
- 2) Approval of minutes from the March 23, 2023 meeting
Zais moved and Graf seconded. No one had revisions to the minutes so the Committee approved the minutes as written. Motion carried.
- 3) Citizen Comments - None
- 4) Projects/Discussions
 - a) Waste and Recycling
 - i. June 3rd Ashland Spring Clean Up
Wiley explained that this event was scheduled for June 3rd and that the flyer was included in the packet materials.
 - ii. June 20th Cleansweeps Event – Update
Radke informed the Committee that this is the 28th year in a row for the event and it costs \$10,000 every year and the County Board approves it every year. The UW Extension promotes it. The organizers have good volunteers and Radke explained that the event is from 2-6 pm on a Tuesday at Northwoods Technical College in the parking lot. They greet people, give information, and thank them for disposing of things appropriately. They do a survey to obtain more information from people when they are in line. It has been a fun event. Peterman stated he had a good time doing it last year. Radke explained that there are two shifts: 1:45pm – 3:45pm and 4 pm – 6 pm. There is a free box lunch for people that do the second shift. The event occurs rain or shine. Amman explained that the old flyer from the water bill had a June 30 date. Radke asked Public Works to be at the Spring Clean Up with flyers and also reached out to the press since the date is now June 20th. Zais asked Radke if they take old paint at the event. Radke explained that they take old paint except for latex. Latex can be put in garbage as long as it is dry. Oil based paints are acceptable. June 6th Radke is having a one-hour webinar and is interviewing the head of NWRPC who started this. The webinar will occur at noon and it will be on the UW website. Amman asked for items not accepted

if we have somewhere where we can say what to do with these things. Radke answered that there is such a huge variety of unacceptable items so the UW Extension has put together a guide of where you can take some items. CNG for example can go to a natural gas dealer. Vaping pens are now allowed at the Cleansweeps events. Drugs for Donuts exchange allows people to bring unused/unwanted medications.

b) Climate Change

i. 25x25 Plan further discussion

Wiley provided an update on low hanging Focus on Energy LED replacements/rebates. Peterman mentioned charging stations. Graf mentioned the ribbon cutting for the charging stations. Graf asked about the PD solar. Wiley explained it is online and that he needed to follow up.

c) Water

i. Develop Sourcewater Protection Plan initial Recommendations –

Radke stated that there was much room for community engagement to go through recommendations and look at who can work on what. This is important. She wanted to have the community engaged in Sourcewater protection. She asked if it was possible to do something as a group. Peterman suggested doing a survey if we are interested in getting community input. Wiley explained that he can follow up with staff on the proper survey medium. Graf asked if the committee could cherry pick certain items in the plan to promote. Radke answered that the committee can at least tell people that this is something the city has. There are low hanging fruits such as water conservation in homes and businesses. Graf suggested maybe bring in committee members to help cherry pick things. Radke explained that there are items in there that could use subcommittees and suggested bringing back to the July meeting. The Committee could focus on the section with the action steps. Graf proposed examining it little by little. Radke suggested perhaps just start by looking at goals and recommendations. Peterman asked if everyone be willing to take a look at that section prior to the next meeting. Committee members answered that they were.

d) Annual Report for City Council

Peterman stated that this has been on the agenda for awhile. His understanding that the Committee has never actually submitted an annual report to City Council. Graf stated that not too many committees have submitted reports so Sustainability is not an anomaly. She mentioned the Committee of the Whole meeting where Council reps give committee updates. Peterman asked the Committee what the annual report would look like. He asked if it would be paragraphs or a 2 hour presentation. Wiley mentioned the annual report that was required for Green Tier and the Oshkosh State of the City event he participated in when he worked in Oshkosh. Committee members supported an open house. Radke stated that No Mow May is an example of something that came from this committee and that the committee is doing good things. Graf supported doing a night where Sustainability has a display. Radke suggested a fact sheet could be attached to Green Tier or emailed to Council. Radke asked if it was viable to write such a fact sheet. Peterman explained that Ullman has her website and that is a source of information. Radke and Peterman will put together an outline of

initiatives going on. Peterman asked Radke to send photographs to Wiley along with an outline. Peterman will send list of accomplishments from the past two years. The committee discussed photo ideas such as fruit trees, community garden, native plantings, etc. They stated that they would send information to Wiley next week. Amman mentioned the dark sky promotion from last spring.

e) Solar Incentives Proposal

Peterman asked if anyone was in charge of this. Zais was excited but was not sure what it was. Wiley was not sure. Radke asked if it had to do with funding (BIL, etc.) Amman stated that the Committee had talked about it and Graf asked if this was to be with Bill Bailey. Committee members believed it was and Wiley explained that he could reach out to Bill Bailey potentially for the July meeting. Radke explained that Bayfield was writing a multi-million dollar grant for EV charging infrastructure. Graf asked if it was City of Bayfield or Bayfield County. Radke stated it was Bayfield County. Mark Abeles-Allison is involved. The committee could also consider bringing it to Dan Grady at Ashland County.

f) Complete Streets

i. Discussion - Ullman wanted it on so the committee held off for now.

g) Green Tier Legacy Communities

i. Update and Annual Report Discussion - Wiley provided an update and stated that he would send out the new annual report format to everyone.

h) Great Lakes Friendly Restaurant Certification

i) Discussion

Amman had a meeting in April and the person who leads the Great Lakes was on the call along with a gentleman from Duluth who is starting a grassroots effort over there. They were excited to hear the committee was interested. Amman supported connecting our desire to bring this to the community with the 25x25 plan. The Committee could shop this concept around with restaurants as we explore it. It could work with fine dining, food trucks, schools, etc. Committee members asked if they have had fast food restaurants do it. Amman answered not yet but that is an area for improvement. Graf asked what it takes to be Great Lakes Friendly. Amman explained that there is a list of criteria. The City and Sustainability Committee moving it forward is new to the organizers of the initiative. The Committee can explore how we track who signs up, etc. Once we have a general idea, the organizers would help us roll it out. It could be possible to tie it to Great Lakes paddleboard surfing, etc. If Ashland develops a chapter here, we could join in/merge chapters in the area together. There is room for growth but the committee would have to lay parameters down. Amman asked Committee to check out the Surfrider Foundation-Great Lakes page. She said she could also send out the Northshore one. She was not sure how to proceed. Peterman believed this is a great opportunity and asked if there is an item on the agenda that we are comfortable dropping for the time being to get to this. Wiley mentioned potentially having a “parking lot” section that we can move such an item to in order to not forget but keep on and not necessarily discuss. Radke stated that Mary McPhetridge from the Chamber has been here 25 years and knows her business and the committee could approach her. The committee could also approach Northland College.

j) Seed Mix

- i. Discussion – Committee members saw spraying but are not sure what the City is using. Graf stated that Sara from Parks was talking about getting into it more. Graf can reach out to Sara. Amman wanted something in City contracts about approving whatever is used. Amman stated that this would be for the City and for the contractors. Graf will follow up and have a report on something. Amman has been in touch with Sara. The question arose of who handles the contracts. Some accountability or contract specification would help. Graf stated that maybe the contractor has to submit something showing what they are putting on the ground. This would apply to public projects and terraces/water lines. Sara and John are the people to check with.
- 5) Future agenda items
Graf saw that in MN there was a place paying people to get rid of their yards and put in plantings for pollinators. They are getting rid of lawns and paying \$2,000 per yard. She wants to look into it. May run into resistance but she is interested and will do some research. Peterman would like to provide a community garden update.
- 6) Adjournment
Amman moved and Graf seconded. The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Steven Wiley
Planning and Development Director

Complete Streets Information

Here are a few Complete Streets Links from Kate: (Note that the framework can be used in any size community)

10 Elements of a complete streets policy <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/10-elements-of-complete-streets/>

Bik Fed Complete Streets graphic <https://wisconsinbikefed.org/what-we-do/advocacy/milwaukee-complete-streets-for-all/>

City of Madison Complete Streets website
<https://www.cityofmadison.com/transportation/initiatives/complete-green-streets>

This document highlights communities with good policies and provides model language. <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Best-Complete-Streets-Policies-of-2018.pdf>

The Elements of a Complete Streets Policy

Effective 2018



Smart Growth America
Improving lives by improving communities



**National Complete
Streets Coalition**



1152 15th Street NW, Suite 450
Washington, DC 20005
202-207-3355

www.smartgrowthamerica.org/completestreets

Elements of a Complete Streets Policy | Effective 2018

The National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) previously identified 10 elements of a comprehensive Complete Streets policy to help communities develop and implement policies and practices that ensure streets are safe for people of all ages and abilities, balance the needs of different modes, and support local land uses, economies, cultures, and natural environments.

The Complete Streets movement has since evolved from when it first began over a decade ago to focus far more on implementation and equity. In response to these changes, in 2017 the Coalition updated and revised the Complete Streets policy framework to require more accountability from jurisdictions and provisions that account for the needs of the most vulnerable users. The 10 revised policy elements are based on decades of collective expertise in transportation planning and design, created in consultation with NCSC's steering committee members and a group of national stakeholders consisting of engineers, planners, researchers, and advocates.

The elements serve as a national model of best practices that can be implemented in nearly all types of Complete Streets policies at all levels of governance. For communities considering a Complete Streets policy, this resource serves as a model; for communities with an existing Complete Streets policy, this resource provides guidance on areas for improvements.

An ideal Complete Streets policy includes the following:

1. **Vision and intent:** Includes an equitable vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets. Specifies need to create complete, connected, network and specifies at least four modes, two of which must be biking or walking.
2. **Diverse users:** Benefits all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most underinvested and underserved communities.
3. **Commitment in all projects and phases:** Applies to new, retrofit/reconstruction, maintenance, and ongoing projects.
4. **Clear, accountable expectations:** Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval and public notice prior to exceptions being granted.
5. **Jurisdiction:** Requires interagency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on Complete Streets.
6. **Design:** Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines and sets a time frame for their implementation.
7. **Land use and context sensitivity:** Considers the surrounding community's current and expected land use and transportation needs.
8. **Performance measures:** Establishes performance standards that are specific, equitable, and available to the public.
9. **Project selection criteria:** Provides specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for Complete Streets implementation.
10. **Implementation steps:** Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy.

Table of contents

Vision and intent	3
Diverse users	4
Commitment in all projects and phases	5
Clear accountable, exceptions	6
Jurisdiction	8
Design	9
Land use and context sensitivity	10
Performance measures	12
Project selection criteria	13
Implementation steps	14
Additional elements	16
Point values	16

1. Vision and intent

A Complete Streets vision states a community's commitment to integrate a Complete Streets approach into their transportation practices, policies, and decision-making processes. This vision should describe a community's motivation to pursue Complete Streets, such as improved economic, health, safety, access, resilience, or environmental sustainability outcomes. The vision should acknowledge the importance of how Complete Streets contribute to building a comprehensive transportation network. This means that people are able to travel to and from their destinations in a reasonable amount of time and in a safe, reliable, comfortable, convenient, affordable, and accessible manner using whatever mode of transportation they choose or rely on.

This does not mean putting a bike lane on every street or a bus on every corridor. Rather, it requires decision-makers to consider the needs of diverse modes that use the transportation system, including but not limited to walking, biking, driving, wheeling/rolling, riding public transit, car sharing/carpooling, paratransit, taxis, delivering goods and services, and providing emergency response transportation.

12 points available:

- 3 points: The policy is clear in intent, stating firmly the jurisdiction's commitment to a Complete Streets approach, using "shall" or "must" language. This needs to be in the body of the legislation, not the "whereas" statement.
 - (1 point) – The policy states the jurisdiction "may" or "considers" Complete Streets in their transportation planning and decision-making processes.
 - (0 points) – The policy language is indirect with regard to their intent to apply a Complete Streets approach, using language such as "consider Complete Streets principles or elements."
- 2 points: mentions the need to create a complete, connected, network.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: specifies at least one motivation or benefit of pursuing Complete Streets.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 1 point: specifies equity as an additional motivation or benefit of pursuing Complete Streets.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 4 points: specifies modes, with a base of four modes, two of which must be biking and walking.
 - (0 points) Policy mentions fewer than four modes and/or omits biking or walking.

2. Diverse users

Complete Streets are intended to benefit all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most underinvested and underserved communities. Transportation choices should be safe, convenient, reliable, affordable, accessible, and timely regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, income, gender identity, immigration status, age, ability, languages spoken, or level of access to a personal vehicle. Which communities of concern are disproportionately impacted by transportation policies and practices will vary depending on the context of the jurisdiction. Policies are not necessarily expected to list all of these groups. For example, some communities are more racially homogeneous, but have extreme income disparities. The best Complete Streets policies will specifically highlight communities of concern whom the policy will prioritize based on the jurisdiction's composition and objectives.

9 points available:

- 5 points: The policy language requires the jurisdiction to “prioritize” vulnerable users or neighborhoods with histories of systematic disinvestment or underinvestment. This could include neighborhoods with insufficient infrastructure or neighborhoods with a concentration of vulnerable users.
 - (3 points) Policy states its intent to “benefit” the neighborhoods or vulnerable users above, as relevant to the jurisdiction.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions or considers any of the neighborhoods or users above.
 - (0 point) No mention.
- 4 points: The policy establishes an accountable, measurable definition for priority groups or places. This definition may be quantitative (i.e. neighborhoods with X% of the population without access to a vehicle or where the median income is below a certain threshold) or qualitative (i.e. naming specific neighborhoods).
 - (0 point) No mention.

3. Commitment in all projects and phases

The ideal Complete Streets policy has a strong commitment that all transportation projects and maintenance operations account for the needs of all modes of transportation and all users of the road network.

10 points available:

For municipality/county policies

- 4 points: Policy requires all new construction and reconstruction/retrofit projects to account for the needs of all modes of transportation and all users of the road network.
 - (1 point) Policy considers or mentions these projects as opportunities to apply this policy.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 4 points: Policy requires all maintenance projects and ongoing operations, such as resurfacing, repaving, restriping, rehabilitation, or other types of changes to the transportation system to account for the needs of all modes of transportation and all users of the road network.
 - (1 point) Policy considers or mentions these projects as opportunities to apply this policy.
 - (0 points) No mention.

For state/MPO policies

- 4 points: Policy requires all new construction and reconstruction/retrofit projects receiving state or federal funding to account for the needs of all modes of transportation and all users of the road network.
 - (1 point) Policy considers or mentions these projects as opportunities to apply this policy.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 4 points: Policy requires all maintenance projects and ongoing operations, such as resurfacing, repaving, restriping, rehabilitation, or other types of changes to the transportation system receiving state or federal funding to account for the needs of all modes of transportation and all users of the road network.
 - (1 point) Policy considers or mentions these projects as opportunities to apply this policy.
 - (0 points) No mention.

For all policies

- 2 points: Policy specifies the need to provide accommodations for all modes of transportation to continue to use the road safely and efficiently during any construction or repair work that infringes on the right of way and/or sidewalk.

4. Clear, accountable exceptions

Effective policy implementation requires a process for exceptions to providing for all modes in each project. The exception process must also be transparent by providing public notice with opportunity for comment and clear, supportive documentation justifying the exception. The Coalition believes the following exceptions are appropriate with limited potential to weaken the policy. They follow the Federal Highway Administration's guidance on accommodating bicycle and pedestrian travel and identified best practices frequently used in existing Complete Streets policies.¹

1. Accommodation is not necessary on corridors where specific users are prohibited, such as interstate freeways or pedestrian malls. Exclusion of certain users on particular corridors should not exempt projects from accommodating other permitted users.
2. Cost of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. The Coalition does not recommend attaching a percentage to define "excessive," as the context for many projects will require different portions of the overall project budget to be spent on the modes and users expected. Additionally, in many instances the costs may be difficult to quantify. A percentage cap may be appropriate in unusual circumstances, such as where natural features (e.g. steep hillsides, shorelines) make it very costly or impossible to accommodate all modes. The Coalition does not believe a cap lower than 20 percent is appropriate, and any cap should always be used in an advisory rather than absolute sense.
3. A documented absence of current and future need.
4. Emergency repairs such as a water main leak that requires immediate, rapid response; however, temporary accommodations for all modes should still be made. Depending on severity of the repairs, opportunities to improve multimodal access should still be considered where possible.

Many communities have included other exceptions that the Coalition, in consultation with transportation planning and engineering experts, also feels are unlikely to create loopholes:

1. Transit accommodations are not required where there is no existing or planned transit service.
2. Routine maintenance of the transportation network that does not change the roadway geometry or operations, such as mowing, sweeping, and spot repair.
3. Where a reasonable and equivalent project along the same corridor is already programmed to provide facilities exempted from the project at hand.

In addition to defining exceptions through good policy language, there must be a clear process for granting them, preferably with approval from senior management. Establishing this within a policy provides clarity to staff charged with implementing the policy and improves transparency and accountability to other agencies and residents.

¹ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design.cfm

8 points available:

- 4 points: Policy includes one or more of the above exceptions—and no others.
 - (2 points) Policy includes any other exceptions, including those that weaken the intent of the Complete Streets policy.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: Policy states who is responsible for approving exceptions.
- 2 points: Policy requires public notice prior to granting an exception in some form. This could entail a public meeting or an online posting with opportunity for comment.

5. Jurisdiction

Creating Complete Streets networks is difficult because many different agencies control our streets. They are built and maintained by state, county, and local agencies, and private developers often build new roads. Individual jurisdictions do have an opportunity to influence the actions of others, through funding or development review. In the case of private developers, this may entail the developer submitting how they will address Complete Streets in their project through the jurisdiction's permitting process, with approval of the permit being contingent upon meeting the Complete Streets requirements laid out by the jurisdiction. Creating a Complete Streets network can also be achieved through interagency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on Complete Streets.

8 points available:

For municipality/county policies

- 5 points: A municipality's or county's policy requires private development projects to comply.
 - (2 points) A municipality's or county's policy mentions or encourages private development projects to follow a Complete Streets approach.
 - (0 points) No mention.

For state/MPO policies

- 5 points: A state's or Metropolitan Planning Organization's policy clearly notes that projects that address how they will account for the needs of all modes and users are prioritized or awarded extra weight for funding and/or inclusion in long-range transportation improvement plans (TIPs).
 - (2 points) A state's or MPO's policy mentions or encourages projects receiving money passing through the agency to account for the needs all modes and users.
 - (0 points) No mention.

For all policies

- 3 points: Policy specifies a requirement for interagency coordination between various agencies such as public health, housing, planning, engineering, transportation, public works, city council, and/or mayor or executive office.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions or encourages interagency coordination.
 - (0 points) No mention.

6. Design

Complete Streets implementation relies on using the best and latest state-of-the-practice design standards and guidelines to maximize design flexibility. Creating meaningful change on the ground both at the project level and in the creation of complete, multimodal transportation networks requires jurisdictions to create or update their existing design guidance and standards to advance the objectives of the Complete Streets policy.

7 points available:

- 5 points: Policy directs the adoption of specific, best state-of-the-practice design guidance and/or requires the development/revision of internal design policies and guides.
 - (1 point) Policy references but does not formally adopt specific, best state-of-the-practice design guidance.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: Policy sets a specific time frame for implementation.
 - (0 points) No mention.

7. Land use and context sensitivity

An effective Complete Streets policy must be sensitive to the surrounding community including its current and planned buildings, parks, and trails, as well as its current and expected transportation needs. Specifically, it is critical to recognize the connection between land use and transportation. Complete Streets must be designed to serve the current and future land use, while land use policies and zoning ordinances must support Complete Streets such as by promoting dense, mixed-use, transit-oriented development with homes, jobs, schools, transit, and recreation in close proximity depending on the context. Given the range of policy types and their varying ability to address this issue, a policy, at a minimum, requires the consideration of context sensitivity in making decisions. The best Complete Streets policies will meaningfully engage with land use by integrating transportation and land use in plans, policies, and practices. The Coalition also encourages more detailed discussion of adapting roads to fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood and development, as well as the consideration of unintended consequences such as displacement of residents due to rising costs of living.

10 points available:

For municipality/county policies

- 5 points: Policy requires new or revised land use policies, plans, zoning ordinances, or equivalent documents to specify how they will support and be supported by the community's Complete Streets vision
 - (4 points) Policy requires new or revised transportation plans and/or design guidance to specify how transportation projects will serve current and future land use, such as by defining streets based not just on transportation function but on the surrounding land use.
 - (2 points) Policy discusses the connection between land use and transportation or includes non-binding recommendations to integrate land use and transportation planning.
 - (1 point) Policy acknowledges land use as a factor related to transportation planning.
 - (0 points) No mention.

For state/MPO policies

- 5 points: Policy requires new or revised long-range transportation plans and/or design guidance to specify how transportation projects will serve current and future land use such as by directing the adoption of place-based street typologies
 - (2 points) Policy discusses the connection between land use and transportation or includes non-binding recommendations to integrate land use and transportation planning.
 - (1 point) Policy acknowledges land use as a factor related to transportation planning.
 - (0 points) No mention.

For all policies

- 3 points: Policy requires the consideration of the community context as a factor in decision-making.
 - (1 points) Policy mentions community context as a potential factor in decision-making.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: Policy specifies the need to mitigate unintended consequences such as involuntary displacement.
 - (1 points) Policy acknowledges the possibility of unintended consequences.
 - (0 points) No mention.

8. Performance measures

Communities with Complete Streets policies can measure success a number of different ways, such as miles of bike lanes, percentage of the sidewalk network completed, number of people who choose to ride public transportation, and/or the number of people walking and biking along a street. They can also measure the impact of Complete Streets on the other motivations and objectives specified in the policy, such as health, safety, economic development, resilience, etc. The best Complete Streets policies will establish performance measures in line with the goals stated in their visions. Performance measures should pay particular attention to how Complete Streets implementation impacts the communities of concern identified in the policy. By embedding equity in performance measures, jurisdictions can evaluate whether disparities are being exacerbated or mitigated. Policies should also set forth an accountable process to measure performance, including specifying who will be responsible for reporting on progress and how often these indicators will be tracked.

13 points available:

- 3 points: Policy establishes specific performance measures under multiple categories such as access, economy, environment, safety, and health.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions measuring performance under multiple categories but does not establish specific measures.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: Policy establishes specific performance measures for the implementation process such as tracking how well the public engagement process reaches underrepresented populations or updates to policies and documents.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions measuring the implementation process but does not establish specific measures.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 3 points: Policy embeds equity in performance measures by measuring disparities by income/race/vehicle access/language/etc. as relevant to the jurisdiction.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions embedding equity in performance measures but is not specific about how data will be disaggregated.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: Policy specifies a time frame for recurring collection of performance measures.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 2 points: Policy requires performance measures to be released publicly.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 1 point: Policy assigns responsibility for collecting and publicizing performance measures to a specific individual/agency/committee.
 - (0 points) No mention.

9. Project selection criteria

A Complete Streets policy should modify the jurisdiction's project selection criteria for funding to encourage Complete Streets implementation. Criteria for determining the ranking of projects should include assigning weight for active transportation infrastructure; targeting underserved communities; alleviating disparities in health, safety, economic benefit, access destinations; and creating better multimodal network connectivity for all users. Jurisdictions should include equity criteria in their project selection process and give the criteria meaningful weight.

8 points available:

- 5 points: Policy establishes specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for Complete Streets implementation.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions revising project selection criteria to encourage Complete Streets implementation.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 3 points: Policy specifically addresses how equity will be embedded in project selection criteria.
 - (0 points) No mention.

10. Implementation steps

A formal commitment to the Complete Streets approach is only the beginning. The Coalition has identified key steps to implementation:

1. Restructure or revise related procedures, plans, regulations, and other processes to accommodate all users on every project. This could include incorporating Complete Streets checklists or other tools into decision-making processes.
2. Develop new design policies and guides or revise existing to reflect the current state of best practices in transportation design. Communities may also elect to adopt national or state-level recognized design guidance.
3. Offer workshops and other training opportunities to transportation staff, community leaders, and the general public so that everyone understands the importance of the Complete Streets vision. Training could focus on Complete Streets design and implementation, community engagement, and/or equity.
4. Create a committee to oversee implementation. This is a critical accountability measure, ensuring the policy becomes practice. The committee should include both external and internal stakeholders as well as representatives from advocacy groups, underinvested communities, and vulnerable populations such as people of color, older adults, children, low-income communities, non-native English speakers, those who do not own or cannot access a car, and those living with disabilities.
5. Create a community engagement plan that considers equity by targeting advocacy organizations and underrepresented communities which could include non-native English speakers, people with disabilities, etc. depending on the local context. This requires the use of outreach strategies such as holding public meetings at easily accessible times and places, collecting input at community gathering spaces, and hosting and attending community meetings and events. The best community engagement plans don't require people to alter their daily routines to participate. Outreach strategies should make use of natural gathering spaces such as clinics, schools, parks, and community centers.

15 points available:

- 3 points: Policy requires that related procedures, plans, regulations, and other processes be revised within a specified time frame.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions revising procedures, plans, regulations, and other processes.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 3 points: Policy requires workshops or other training opportunities for transportation staff. Policy is specific about the timing and/or staff members for the training and workshops.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions workshops or other training opportunities for transportation staff.
 - (0 points) No mention.
- 3 points: Policy assigns responsibility for implementation to a new or existing

committee that includes both internal and external stakeholders that are representative of underinvested and vulnerable communities. Policy is specific about which internal and external stakeholders are/will be represented on the committee.

- (1 point) Policy assigns oversight of implementation to a specific body that may not include both internal and external stakeholders.
- (0 points) No mention.
- 6 points: Policy creates a community engagement plan with specific strategies for who, when, and how they will approach public engagement in the project selection, design, and implementation process. Policy specifically addresses how the jurisdiction will overcome barriers to engagement for underrepresented communities.
 - (3 points) Policy creates a community engagement plan with specific strategies for who, when, and how they will approach public engagement but does not address underrepresented communities.
 - (1 point) Policy mentions community engagement but does not go into detail about specific strategies.
 - (0 points) No mention.

Additional elements

While Complete Streets policies are based on the principle of connecting people and place to transportation projects, many communities add language regarding environmental best practices or placemaking directives. Though the Coalition does not score these additional elements, we encourage agencies to consider cross-referencing related initiatives.

Point values

Vision and intent	12 points
Diverse users	9 points
Commitment in all projects and phases	10 points
Exceptions	8 points
Jurisdiction	8 points
Design	7 points
Land use and context sensitivity	10 points
Performance measures	13 points
Project selection criteria	8 points
Implementation steps	15 points
Total:	100 points

Cover photo credits

Top left: Flickr photo by Places for Bikes. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/placesforbikes/31712244886/>

Top right: & bottom left: Flickr photo by Adam Coppola. <https://www.flickr.com/people/greenlaneproject/>

Bottom right: Courtesy of the City of Chattanooga