



American Planning Association

*Creating Great Communities for All*

# Toolkit to Integrate Health and Equity Into Comprehensive Plans

*Using the Sustaining Places-Best Practices  
for Comprehensive Plans Framework*

Sagar Shah, PHD, AICP and Brittany Wong



# CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgments.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
The Toolkit.....	5
How to use this Toolkit.....	6
<b>Model Language to align with Comprehensive Plan standards.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Interwoven Equity.....	7
Healthy Community.....	16
Authentic Participation.....	23
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Findings.....	32
Recommendations.....	32
<b>References .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>35</b>
Methodology.....	35
Plan Selection.....	35
Plan Analysis.....	35
Data Analysis.....	36
<b>Appendix B .....</b>	<b>37</b>
Links to Plan Documents and Updates and Health Impact Assessments (HIAs).....	37

©2020 American Planning Association, which has offices at 205 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 1200, Chicago, IL 60601-5927, and 1030 15th St., NW, Suite 750 West, Washington, DC 20005-1503; [planning.org](http://planning.org).

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means without permission in writing from APA.

Cover Credit: [pinkbadger/iStock/Getty Images Plus](https://www.gettyimages.com/detail/stock-photo/pinkbadger)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

American Planning Association’s Planning and Community Health (PCH) program developed this toolkit to help planners integrate health and equity considerations into their comprehensive plans. PCH advances practices that improve human environments to promote health and equity through policies, education, and place-based interventions.

This project is supported by a grant from the [Health Impact Project](#), a collaboration of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts. The Health Impact Project encourages local, state, and national organizations to include health considerations in policy decisions across multiple sectors, such as housing, transportation, and education.

APA is especially grateful to Debarati “Mimi” Majumdar Narayan, PHD, and Emily Bever from the Health Impact Project for their invaluable feedback and support throughout the project. APA is also thankful to the following individuals for providing feedback on how this toolkit could be used by planners in their practice:

- Ashley Hefner, AICP, Advance Planning Manager, City of Culver City, California
- Meaghan Overton, AICP, City Planner at the City of Fort Collins, Colorado
- Rebecca Stonefield, Principal Planner, Pinellas County Government, Florida

This work was managed and authored by the following people:

- Sagar Shah, PHD, AICP
- Brittany Wong

Disclaimer: The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Health Impact Project, The Pew Charitable Trusts, or the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Comprehensive plans are the foundational policy document for local governments, and a primary tool for planners to address community priorities in long-range planning. Planners who would like to focus on health and equity in their comprehensive plan and plan-making processes can use this toolkit to address those priorities. The toolkit builds on APA’s [Comprehensive Plan Standards for Sustaining Places](#) initiative, which established a framework for addressing the sustainability of human settlements through comprehensive plans. Among the 10 components of this framework, the toolkit focuses on the following three (two principles and one process):

- Interwoven Equity
- Healthy Communities
- Authentic Participation

Fifteen comprehensive plans were reviewed to collect the model language about goals, policies, and action items for the 16 “best practices” (as defined in the framework) under the *Interwoven Equity* and *Healthy Communities* principles. While these practices are essential to healthy communities, it is also necessary to focus on equitable ways to create plans. Hence, this toolkit also captures approaches used by these 15 communities to address the seven “best practices” under *Authentic Participation*. Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) can be used to inform the integration of health and equity into the comprehensive plans and the plan-making process. The toolkit also provides examples of HIA applications for several best practices.

## INTRODUCTION

The planning profession was established to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people. Planning for health means focusing on all the places where people live, learn, work, and play. Research shows that integrating health into planning practice leads to positive health outcomes. In the last two decades, there has been an increased focus on “place” as an essential factor in improving individual and community health. With “place” gaining importance, the role of planners in creating healthy communities has become even more prominent.

Planners influence people’s health and well-being directly or indirectly. There are many domains of the built environment (active living, food systems, environmental exposures, emergency preparedness, and social cohesion) where planners have the opportunity to impact health, as explained in The American Planning Association’s (APA) [Metrics for Planning Healthy Communities](#). For instance, when planners work to create more walkable neighborhoods, they are directly influencing health outcomes by promoting physical activity. Similarly, when planners work on creating a jobs-housing balance through policies and regulations, they are indirectly affecting health because access to employment opportunities is an important social determinant of health.

Planners also play a central role in promoting health equity. APA’s [Healthy Communities Policy Guide](#) defines health equity as: 1) When everyone has the opportunity to attain their full health potential and no one is disadvantaged from achieving this potential because of their social position or other socially determined circumstance; and 2) A situation in which, regardless of individual behavior, individuals have access to equal opportunities for positive health outcomes. Often, low-income and communities of color bear the negative consequences of an unhealthy built environment. Due to decades of disinvestment, these communities are more likely to have poor access to infrastructure that supports physical activity; clean air, water, and soil; healthy food; affordable housing; and transportation. Low-income and communities of color often experience high rates of chronic diseases such as cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, obesity, and asthma because their environments are not health-promoting. Planners should strive to remove these disparities in the built environment through plans and policies. While some root causes of health inequities such

as discriminatory practices and structural racism may require broader culture change, planners can play a role in creating more equitable transportation, housing, and land-use systems to achieve health equity.

Planners can use various tools, such as long-range community vision and goal setting, plan making, standards, policies, and incentives, development work, or public investments, to plan for healthy and equitable communities. Among these tools, the local comprehensive or general plan is the foundational policy document for local governments that sets the direction for future planning activities, and thus it is important to addressing health and health equity. Traditionally, comprehensive plans have focused on elements such as transportation and housing, but many contemporary comprehensive plans have started including health and equity considerations.

A comprehensive plan update or rewrite involves a significant public participation process. Among many historically underserved groups, there is a lack of trust in the government, which makes it hard to get their participation in the process. Planners work closely with community residents and other stakeholders in the plan-making process and thus could play a crucial role in achieving equitable public engagement. However, achieving equitable public participation is no small endeavor, and with increasing national and local attention on deeply rooted inequities in our communities, planners are seeking guidance to address such matters in their comprehensive plans.

In 2015, APA published a framework for comprehensive plans called, [Sustaining Places: Best Practices for Comprehensive Plans](#), (*standards*) to help communities of all sizes achieve sustainable and healthy outcomes. The *standards* are organized into 10 components: six principles, two processes, and two attributes, and each of these components has a set of corresponding *best practices* that can inform the comprehensive plans.

### What is a Best Practice?

Sustaining Places: Best Practices for Comprehensive Plans framework defines *best practices* as the **planning action tools** that communities employ to activate the principles, processes, and attributes in their comprehensive plans.

## THE TOOLKIT

The purpose of this toolkit is to help planners working at the local level integrate health and equity into their comprehensive plans by focusing on three *components* (two principles and one process) of the *standards*: Interwoven Equity<sup>1</sup>, Healthy Community<sup>2</sup>, and Authentic Participation<sup>3</sup>. These three components include a total of 23 *best practices*<sup>4</sup>. In order to make this toolkit most helpful to practicing planners, we worked with three communities – Culver City, California; Fort Collins, Colorado; and Pinellas County, Florida, which were in the process of updating their comprehensive plans. Based on the feedback received from planners working in these communities, APA, in partnership with the Health Impact Project, decided that the most effective way to help planners integrate health and equity into their plans would be to inform them about the ways other communities have integrated the best practices into their plans.

- 1 Interwoven Equity: “Ensure fairness and equity in providing for the housing, services, health, safety, and livelihood needs of all citizens and groups.”
- 2 Healthy Community: “Ensure that public health needs are recognized and addressed through provisions for healthy foods, physical activity, access to recreation, health care, environmental justice, and safe neighborhoods.”
- 3 Authentic Participation: “Ensure that the planning process actively involves all segments of the community in analyzing issues, generating visions, developing plans, and monitoring outcomes.”
- 4 A best practice example of “Interwoven Equity” principle is, “Promote environmental justice.”

We reviewed comprehensive plans of 15 communities to collect the model language associated with each of the best practices. The collected information was reviewed for its alignment with the best practices, and then compiled in a tabular format. The tables capture the model language of Goals, Policy, Action, and Approach from the existing comprehensive plan. For the principles *Interwoven Equity* and *Healthy Community*, the table provides model language of Goals, Policies, and Actions, and for the process *Authentic Participation* the table captures the approach that was used for engaging the residents in the comprehensive plan-making process. More information about the methodology is in Appendix A.

Since each comprehensive plan is structured differently and uses different vocabulary (e.g., the term “objective” instead of “goals” or term “strategies” rather than “actions”), the above definitions were used to extract the language from the comprehensive plans.

- The **Goal** is a general statement of a future condition that is desired by the community.
- **Policies** are the long-range policies that a community can adopt, and
- **Action** contains specific steps (sometimes measurable) that will have to be taken to achieve the goals.
- **Approach** refers to the strategies used by the planners to engage community residents in the public participation process

### How do Health Impact Assessments (HIA) inform comprehensive plans?

Health impact assessments (HIAs) are one way to bring health evidence to decisions related to planning. Planning professionals have often used HIAs as a tool to bring together scientific data, health expertise, and public input to better understand how a proposed plan, policy, or project in the built environment might affect the public's health. The process engages stakeholders to help communities and decision makers collectively identify the potential health effects of decisions; how those impacts might disproportionately affect different racial, income, geographic, and other groups; and how that distribution can influence health outcomes. HIAs then use those findings to develop recommendations that can help maximize health benefits and minimize preventable risks, such as chronic disease and injuries (Health Impact Project 2018).

Using an HIA to inform decisions related to a community's comprehensive plan such as transportation, land use, housing, and more is one way planners can ensure that safe, equitable, and healthy policies drive the design of that community's built environment. Some ways in which HIAs can be valuable in informing comprehensive plans include the following:

1. As planners understand, our health is driven by sociopolitical and environmental factors beyond our genetics and behaviors. HIAs take this holistic view of health ensuring that factors such as access to safe, affordable housing; safe recreational facilities; healthy foods; and jobs which are affected by a typical comprehensive plan are considered in generating recommendations to maximize positive health outcomes.
2. The central premise of HIAs is to engage the community in each step of the process. Concerns and priorities of the community related to a comprehensive plan are likely to be well represented as recommendations in the final HIA document. This is an important way to ensure equity in decisions that shape a community's built environment.
3. As communities across the country are beginning to adopt a health-in-all-policies approach, health impact assessments can bring uncommon partners to the table across many sectors, provide a foundation for shared language, and initiate data-sharing practices that can transform how community health is tracked and measured. These can be effective strategies to integrate health and equity in comprehensive plans, which by nature address policies across many sectors.

## HOW TO USE THIS TOOLKIT

Planners who are in the process of rewriting or updating the comprehensive plan can use the model language provided in this toolkit to draft goals, policies, action items, and recommendations. The model language will help planners comprehend how other communities have included health and equity considerations in their plans. Language should be tailored based on the local context in which the planner works.

To efficiently use the toolkit, the authors suggest identifying the best practice that would be most helpful to address a local issue and then refer to the table associated with that best practice. Each table gives examples of goals, policies, actions, and approaches from at least two communities<sup>5</sup>. The tables also include specific citations and page numbers for users to reference the corresponding comprehensive plan for more details on the plan or the context of a specific goal, policy, or action. Additionally, examples (in callout boxes) of how HIAs have helped consider health and equity in comprehensive plans are distributed throughout the toolkit. Appendix B has the links to comprehensive plans and HIAs cited in this toolkit, for further reference.

5 Three best practices (two in Interwoven Equity and one in Authentic Participation) have examples from only one community because they were not frequently included in the comprehensive plans.

## MODEL LANGUAGE TO ALIGN WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STANDARDS

The following tables show the results of the comprehensive plan review. The information is presented in the following structure:

- Principle or Process and its definition as written in the Comprehensive Plan Standards
- Best Practice related to that principle or process with a descriptor. Sample model language of goals, policies, and actions (for Interwoven Equity and Healthy Community) or approaches (for Authentic Participation) derived from existing comprehensive plans

### Interwoven Equity

**Ensure fairness and equity in providing for the housing, services, health, safety, and livelihood needs of all citizens and groups.**

#### Best Practice

**Provide a range of housing types:** A range of housing types is characterized by the presence of residential units of different sizes, configurations, tenures, and price points located in buildings of different sizes, configurations, ages,

and ownership structures. Providing a range of housing types accommodates varying lifestyle choices and affordability needs and makes it possible for households of different sizes and income levels to live in close proximity to one another.

#### COMMUNITY: OKLAHOMA CITY

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Oklahoma City's neighborhoods thrive because they contain quality housing choices to meet the diverse needs of the population.	Goal 3: Housing, p. 224
<b>POLICY</b>	Diversify the housing supply by type and cost. - We will create forces that produce housing diversity through implementation of the land-use plan. - We will create more opportunities for income diversity and mixed-income neighborhoods.	Initiative 5, p. 227
<b>ACTION</b>	Modify codes and/or regulations to create opportunities for more income diversity and mixed-income neighborhoods by allowing a variety of housing ownership and leasing arrangements, diverse housing sizes and types—including accessory dwelling units, carriage homes, lofts, live-work spaces, cottages, and manufactured/modular housing. Modifications should allow an increase the variety of ownership opportunities to include condominiums, ownership cooperatives (such as mutual housing associations, limited equity cooperatives, etc.) by identifying and removing regulatory barriers. Recommend improvements to protections for owners, developers, and lenders. - Priority should be given to projects that achieve efficiencies described elsewhere in <i>planokc</i> , such as dwelling units that are located to have easy access to each other and to other daily needs including jobs, recreation, and schools.	Policy L-12, p. 358

#### COMMUNITY: CITY OF SHERIDAN, COLORADO

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Ensure an appropriate supply of housing in Sheridan at all density and affordability levels.	CLU 2, p. 66
<b>POLICY</b>	Work to ensure the availability of a variety of housing types in Sheridan.	Objective CLU 2.1, p. 67
<b>ACTION</b>	Conduct a review of existing City policies to identify barriers to the development of a variety of housing types that appeal to a broad spectrum of Sheridan residents such as accessory dwelling units and cooperative housing.	CLU 2.1.4, p. 67

#### HIA Application: Oklahoma City

During the scoping process of the *planokc* HIA, a growth analysis was conducted that modeled three different potential scenarios based on population growth, housing market demands, and quality-of-life needs.

**Best Practice**

**Plan for a jobs/housing balance:** A jobs/housing balance is characterized by a roughly equal number of jobs and housing units (households) within a commuter shed. A strong jobs-housing balance can also result in jobs that are better matched to the labor force living in the

commuter shed, resulting in lower vehicle miles traveled, improved worker productivity, and higher overall quality of life. When coordinated with multimodal transportation investments, it improves access to employment opportunities for disadvantaged populations.

<b>COMMUNITY: KAUA'I COUNTY, HAWAII</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Opportunity: Promoting Diversity & Equity - Ensure affordable housing is provided in proximity to job centers.	Housing, p. 96
<b>POLICY</b>	Provide Affordable Housing While Facilitating A Diversity of Privately Developed Housing for Local Families - Recognizing the extraordinary urgency, the County needs to plan for and help facilitate the building of approximately 9,000 housing units by 2035.	Policy 2, p. 39
<b>ACTION</b>	Permitting and Code Changes - Support the development of a limited amount of housing on agricultural land for farm workers and their families by: a. Improving the existing process to obtain Farm Worker Housing Permits and remove barriers to participation b. Providing outreach on the Farm Worker Housing Law to increase participation	Implementation Tool A-1, p. 121

**Best Practice**

**Plan for the physical, environmental, and economic improvement of at-risk, distressed, and disadvantaged neighborhoods:**

At-risk neighborhoods are experiencing falling property values, high real estate foreclosure rates, rapid depopulation, or physical deterioration. Distressed neighborhoods suffer from disinvestment and physical deterioration for many reasons, including (but not limited to) the existence of cheap land on the urban fringe, the financial burdens of maintaining an aging building stock, economic restructuring, land speculation, and the dissolution

or relocation of anchor institutions. A disadvantaged neighborhood is a neighborhood in which residents have reduced access to resources and capital due to factors such as high levels of poverty and unemployment and low levels of educational attainment. These neighborhoods often exhibit high rates of both physical disorder (e.g., abandoned buildings, graffiti, vandalism, litter, disrepair) and social disorder (e.g., crime, violence, loitering, drinking and drug use). Such neighborhoods often need targeted interventions to prevent further decline and jump-start revitalization.

<b>COMMUNITY: ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	St. Louis Park is committed to providing a broad range of housing and neighborhood-oriented development. - Fostering and facilitating reinvestment and redevelopment of neighborhood-oriented businesses and services	Strategic Priorities, p. 1–2
<b>POLICY</b>	Preserve and enhance the livability and unique character of each neighborhood’s residential areas.	Residential Land Use Goal 2, p. 5–138
<b>ACTION</b>	Promote maintenance and reinvestment of existing residential land uses that have experienced deferred maintenance, deteriorating property values, high vacancy rates, or reuse opportunities.	Strategy 2-A, p. 5–138

<b>COMMUNITY: CINCINNATI</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Create a more livable community. - The physical space of a community should help us live healthy, engaged, and positive lives. Driving is becoming more expensive and less desirable, and individuals and families want walkable neighborhoods that encourage interaction. We will adapt our neighborhoods to respond to these growing trends.	Live Goal 2, p. 156
<b>POLICY</b>	Support and stabilize our neighborhoods.	Strategy 2-B, p. 160
<b>ACTION</b>	Respond to our aging housing stock and deteriorating neighborhoods. Cincinnati will analyze and respond to neighborhood deterioration through targeted rehabilitation, modernization, or demolition. - Short-range (1–3 years): Create a comprehensive neighborhood indicators system for tracking neighborhood health and stability. - Mid-range (4–7 years): Develop a plan for future use of surplus land vacated as a result of demolition. - Long-range (8–10 years): Assemble vacant and underutilized properties in targeted areas for larger redevelopment opportunities.	p. 160

<b>COMMUNITY: OKLAHOMA CITY</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Oklahoma City’s neighborhoods are vibrant because they have high occupancy rates, a diverse housing stock, and well-maintained properties.	Goal 4: Neighborhood Stability, p. 224
<b>POLICY</b>	Revitalize and stabilize urban neighborhoods. - We will set neighborhood development priorities by using quantitative evaluation criteria. -We will expand rehabilitation and redevelopment programs to stabilize the physical fabric of neighborhoods.	Initiative 7, p. 229
<b>ACTION</b>	Quickly repair damage caused by vandalism, including graffiti, to minimize negative impacts on neighborhoods. Coordinate the efforts of existing programs, such as the Police Department’s Removal Unit, the Public Works Department’s Removal Unit, and Oklahoma County’s “SHINE” program to increase responses in targeted areas and expand the area which can be covered. Increase participation by the business community, such as donations of paint and time.	Policy L-5, p. 354

**HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado**

The Sheridan Comprehensive Plan HIA used surveys (convenience samples), interactive maps, and coordinated partnerships to assess potential impacts of goals and objectives on the health areas of interest in vulnerable populations.

**Best Practice**

**Plan for improved health and safety for at-risk populations:**

An at-risk population is characterized by vulnerability to health or safety impacts through factors such as race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geography, gender, age, behavior, or disability status. These populations may have additional needs before, during, and after a destabilizing event such as a natural

or human-made disaster or period of extreme weather, or throughout an indefinite period of localized instability related to an economic downturn or a period of social turmoil. At-risk populations include children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, those living in institutionalized settings, those with limited English proficiency, and those who are transportation disadvantaged.

<b>COMMUNITY: CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Equitable and High-Quality Human Services - Collaborate with human service providers in the nonprofit, private and public sectors in their efforts to provide a robust network of human services tailored to the needs of the Richmond community. High-quality and equitable programs for the elderly, children and at-risk populations are integral to enhancing neighborhood stability and helping to shape quality of life for residents.	Goal EH3, p. 2.11
<b>POLICY</b>	Multilingual Information and Services - Encourage public agencies to provide services, classes, outreach materials and information to Richmond residents in multiple formats and languages. Work with the School District, libraries and human service providers to ensure that all residents are aware of and able to participate in available human service programs.	Policy EH3.6, p. 2.19
<b>ACTION</b>	Language Resource Center - Work with community organizations to establish a center to provide language resources to community members, education and human service providers. Services could include: interpretation and translation; non-native English learning programs; and assistance in accessing City services and programs. The center may co-locate with other human service providers.	Action EH3.E, p. 2.22

<b>COMMUNITY: PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Promote and support healthy lifestyles for all Pima County residents.	Health Services Element Goal 1, p. 5.3
<b>POLICY</b>	Monitor and evaluate the direct and indirect effects of increasing temperatures on the health of Pima County residents.	Policy 7, p. 5.3
<b>ACTION</b>	Promote policies and programs to reduce climate vulnerability of underserved communities.	Goal 1 Implementation Measure I, p. 67

**Best Practice**

**Provide accessible, quality public services, facilities, and health care to minority and low-income populations:**

A public service is a service performed for the benefit of the people who live in (and sometimes those who visit) the jurisdiction. A public facility is any building or property—such as a library, park, or community center—owned, leased, or funded by a public entity. Public

services, facilities, and health care should be located so that all members of the public have safe and convenient transportation options to reach quality services and facilities that meet or exceed industry standards for service provision. Minority and low-income populations are often underserved by public services and facilities and health care providers.

<b>COMMUNITY: PLANO, TEXAS</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Plano provides a strong sense of community and high standard of living for its citizens through sustaining strong local partnerships and programs that ensure superior services, diverse cultural amenities, and quality educational opportunities	Social Environment Vision, online
<b>POLICY</b>	Plano will partner with private enterprises, nonprofit organizations, Collin County, Plano Independent School District, and other entities to provide adequate support to underserved populations within the community.	Quality of Life, Social Services Policy, online
<b>ACTION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seek funding through partnerships and grants to provide health, human care, and shelter accommodations that meet the objectives stated in the Consolidated Plan.</li> <li>- Assist local partners in expanding access to health care services for underserved populations.</li> <li>- Develop a plan to identify underserved populations and barriers to participation in parks and recreation programs, and offer inclusionary support strategies to address the barriers</li> </ul>	Social Services Action Statements, online

<b>COMMUNITY: WASHINGTON, D.C.</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Provide high-quality, accessible, efficiently managed, and properly funded community facilities to support the efficient delivery of municipal services, protect public health and safety, and enhance the well-being of current and future District residents.	Community Services and Facilities Goal, p. 11–2
<b>POLICY</b>	Ensure that high quality, affordable primary health centers are available and accessible to all District residents. Emergency medical facilities should be geographically distributed so that all residents have safe, convenient access to such services. New or rehabilitated health care facilities should be developed in medically underserved and/or high poverty neighborhoods, and in areas with high populations of senior citizens, the physically disabled, the homeless, and others with unmet health care needs.	Policy CSF-2.1.1, p. 11–10
<b>ACTION</b>	Review and assess zoning regulations to identify barriers to, and create opportunities for, the development of primary care facilities and neighborhood clinics, including the reuse of existing nonresidential buildings in residential zones, after a public review and approval process that provides an opportunity to address neighborhood impacts.	Action CSF-2.1.B, p. 11

**HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado**

The Sheridan HIA team developed a monitoring plan to track the progress on the implementation of the HIA recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan, and the utilization of the HIA findings in community processes.

**Best Practice**

**Upgrade infrastructure and facilities in older and**

**substandard areas:** Infrastructure comprises the physical systems that allow societies and economies to function. These include water mains, storm and sanitary sewers, electrical grids, telecommunications facilities, and transportation facilities such as bridges, tunnels, and roadways. Upgrading is the process of improving these infrastructure and facilities through the addition or replacement of existing components

with newer versions. An older area is a neighborhood, corridor, or district that has been developed and continuously occupied for multiple decades. A substandard area is a neighborhood, district, or corridor with infrastructure that fails to meet established standards. Targeting infrastructure in older and substandard areas provides a foundation for further community revitalization efforts and improves quality of life for residents in these neighborhoods.

<b>COMMUNITY: PLANO, TEXAS</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Plano provides a strong sense of community and high standard of living for its citizens through sustaining strong local partnerships and programs that ensure superior services, diverse cultural amenities, and quality educational opportunities	Social Environment Vision, online
<b>POLICY</b>	Plano will strategically plan and implement improvements to city facilities and infrastructure to ensure the necessary needs and services are provided to the community.	Quality of Life, Facilities & Infrastructure Policy, online
<b>ACTION</b>	Develop and maintain an asset management system to evaluate and rate the conditions of public infrastructure.	Facilities & Infrastructure Action Statements, online

<b>COMMUNITY: KAUA'I COUNTY, HAWAII</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Opportunity: Promoting Diversity & Equity - Ensure widespread access to health care, education, and services.	Opportunity & Health for All, p. 96
<b>POLICY</b>	Design Healthy and Complete Neighborhoods - Ensure new and existing neighborhoods have safe roads and functional parks, as well as access to jobs, commerce, transit, and public services.	Policy 4, p. 41
<b>ACTION</b>	Projects and Programs - Develop funding sources to expand, improve, and maintain high-quality transportation, water, parks, broadband, and other infrastructure in underserved neighborhoods.	Strategy 1.2 Implementation Tool C-1, p. 204

**Best Practice**

**Plan for workforce diversity and development:**

Workforce diversity is characterized by the employment of a wide variety of people in terms of age, cultural background, physical ability, race and ethnicity, religion, and gender identity. Workforce development is an economic development strategy that focuses on people rather than businesses; it attempts to enhance a region’s

economic stability and prosperity by developing jobs that match existing skills within the local workforce or training workers to meet the labor needs of local industries. Promoting workforce diversity and development is a vital piece of economic development efforts, making areas attractive to employers and enabling residents to find employment in their communities

**COMMUNITY: MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Attract and retain businesses and vital community assets.	Vibrant Economy, p. 68
<b>POLICY</b>	The county will ... through its Workforce Investment Board, collaborate with the Montgomery County Community College, other colleges, the county’s four technical high schools, and other trainers and educators to retrain and support a skilled workforce.	p. 69
<b>ACTION</b>	The county will implement the following strategies to address current labor market needs: - Identifying and bridging skills gaps in the workforce - Developing employer driven partnerships - Developing and expanding career pathways - Using the most effective job matching services in its PA CareerLink system.	p. 69

**COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Nashville’s workforce will match skills needed by today’s employers as well as be prepared for the shift to increasingly higher skilled jobs that will account for most of our expected employment growth.	EWD Goal 3, p. II-114
<b>POLICY</b>	Create direct and available pathways to connect Nashville workers to long-term employment opportunities with identified potential for prosperity with particular emphasis on workers living in poverty.	EWD Policy 3.3, p. II-114
<b>ACTION</b>	Near term (1–3 years): Implement the recommendations of the Diversity Advisory Committee to improve recruitment, hiring, promotions, and retention of a workforce that is inclusive and representative of local demographics. Implementers: Diversity Advisory Committee, Metro Human Resources, Mayor’s Office, Metro Human Relations Commission	EWD Policy 3.3 Action, p. IV-27

**HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado**

The Sheridan HIA called for the promotion of positive marketing practices, rebranding of the city, and coordinating with the Chamber of Commerce to implement communication strategies. It also called for recruiting desirable new businesses to Sheridan that bring living wage jobs to residents and encouraging local hiring.

**Best Practice**

**Protect vulnerable populations from natural hazards:**

A natural hazard is a natural event that threatens lives, property, and other assets. Natural hazards include floods, high wind events, landslides, earthquakes, and wildfires. Vulnerable neighborhoods face higher risks than others

when disaster events occur and may require special interventions to weather those events. A population may be vulnerable for a variety of reasons, including location, socioeconomic status or access to resources, lack of leadership and organization, and lack of planning.

<b>COMMUNITY: KAUAI COUNTY, HAWAII</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Stewardship: Protecting Kaua'i's Unique Beauty - Protect natural, historic, and cultural resources in perpetuity.	The Watershed, p. 96
<b>POLICY</b>	Protect Access to Kaua'i's Treasured Places - Protect access to and customary use of shoreline areas, trails, and places for religious and cultural observances, fishing, gathering, hunting, and recreational activities, such as hiking and surfing.	Policy 16, p. 47
<b>ACTION</b>	Permitting and Code Changes - Minimize coastal hazard risks through planning and development standards that: a. Ensure the safety of individuals, families, and communities within coastal hazard areas and communicate the dangers to residents and tourists. b. Discourage development or redevelopment (including tourist uses) within hazardous areas, while preserving adequate space for expected future growth in areas located outside these areas. c. If hazard risks are unavoidable, minimize hazard risks to new development over the life of authorized structures Plans and Studies - Develop detailed hazard, risk, and vulnerability assessments in low-lying coastal areas based on future data and forecasts regarding climate change. Use this assessment to identify where resources and planning efforts should be focused and to develop adaptation strategies and inform stakeholders including tourists of these dangers.	Strategy 3.3 Implementation Tools A-1 & B-2, p. 108-109

**Best Practice**

**Promote environmental justice:** Environmental justice is defined as the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and

policies. Its goal is to provide all communities and persons across the nation with the same degree of protection from environmental and health hazards and equal access to decision making processes. This results in healthy environments for all in which to live, learn, and work.

<b>COMMUNITY: ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Encourage the orderly, harmonious, and judicious use of land, consistent with the following guiding principles. - Principle 1: Promote sustainable land development that provides for a balance of economic opportunity, social equity including environmental justice, and protection of the natural environment.	Future Land Use Element Goal, p. 5
<b>POLICY</b>	Location and Compatibility	Objective 4.2, p. 99
<b>ACTION</b>	Industrial uses shall not be located adjacent to residential or agricultural areas without adequate buffering or integrating design and business practices to eliminate or minimize adverse impacts. Land-use decisions concerning location of industrial uses shall take into consideration environmental justice.	Policy 4.2.1, p. 99

<b>COMMUNITY: WASHINGTON, D.C.</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Protect, restore, and enhance the natural and man-made environment in the District of Columbia, taking steps to improve environmental quality, prevent and reduce pollution, and conserve the values and functions of the District's natural resources and ecosystems.	Environmental Protection Goal, p. 6-2
<b>POLICY</b>	Address the over-concentration of industrial uses in the District's lower income communities. Develop solutions to reduce the adverse effects of these uses, such as enhanced buffering, sound walls, operational improvements, truck routing, increased monitoring of impacts, and zoning changes to reduce land-use conflicts.	Policy E-4.8.1, p. 6-42
<b>ACTION</b>	Continue to study the link between public health and the location of municipal and industrial uses such as power plants and waste treatment facilities. The findings of such studies should be used to inform public policy decisions and minimize future community health impacts.	Action E-4.8.A, p. 6-43

## Healthy Community

**Ensure that public health needs are recognized and addressed through provisions for healthy foods, physical activity, access to recreation, health care, environmental justice, and safe neighborhoods.**

### Best Practice

**Reduce exposure to toxins and pollutants in the natural and built environments:** Toxins are poisonous substances capable of causing disease in living organisms. Pollutants are waste substances or forms of energy (noise, light, heat), often resulting from industrial processes, that can contaminate air, water, and soil and cause adverse changes in the environment. Examples include carbon monoxide and other gases as

well as soot and particulate matter produced by fossil fuel combustion; toxic chemicals used or created in industrial processes; pesticides and excess nutrients from agricultural operations; and toxic gases released by paints or adhesives. Reducing exposure to toxins and pollutants improves the health of individuals and communities, with concomitant improvements in quality of life and health care cost savings.

COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE		
	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Nashville promotes the safety and wellness of its residents, workers, and visitors.	BE Goal 2, p. II-171
<b>POLICY</b>	Improve the health quality of Nashville's air, water, light, and land, both outside and indoors.	BE Policy 2.2, p. II-171
<b>ACTION</b>	- Near term (1–3 years): Increase the number of low income households receiving free healthy homes assessments and link to resources to address any issues found. Implementers: Metro Health - Long term (7–10 years): Install built and natural infrastructure to mitigate light, air, and noise pollution for residents living in close proximity to urban interstates and the Nashville International Airport. Implementers: TDOT, Airport Authority, Metro Council	BE Policy 2.2 Action, p. IV-49

COMMUNITY: WASHINGTON, D.C.		
	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Protect, restore, and enhance the natural and man-made environment in the District of Columbia, taking steps to improve environmental quality, prevent and reduce pollution, and conserve the values and functions of the District's natural resources and ecosystems.	Environmental Protection Goal, p. 6–2
<b>POLICY</b>	Ensure that land-use planning and development decisions minimize the exposure of residents, workers, and visitors to hazardous substances. New residences, schools, and similarly sensitive uses should not be sited in areas where significant quantities of hazardous substances are handled, stored, or disposed. Likewise, new municipal or industrial facilities that use toxic materials or produce hazardous waste should not be sited in residential or environmentally sensitive areas.	Policy E-4.4.6, p. 6–37
<b>ACTION</b>	Maintain regulatory and inspection programs to ensure that all businesses that store, distribute, or dispose of hazardous materials comply with all applicable health, safety, and environmental requirements. These requirements range from used oil collection facilities at automotive repair shops to emergency contingency plans for the PEPCO power plant to disposal of medical waste from area hospitals and clinics.	Action E-4.4.B, p. 6–37

### HIA Application: Oklahoma City

During the scoping process, the *planokc* HIA utilized the city's parcel data to map industrial sites that could pose as avenues for residential contamination (specifically oil and gas). Their recommendations called for soil, groundwater, and air quality testing on a frequent basis, as well as creating a closed-loop system of material usage and requiring the disclosure of injection containments.

### HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado

By estimating annual average daily traffic, the Sheridan HIA called for improving air and water quality by creating watershed advocacy groups, incentivizing the use of green infrastructure to protect surface and ground waters, and incentivizing tree planting campaigns.

**Best Practice**

**Plan for increased public safety through the reduction of crime and injuries:**

Public safety involves prevention of and protection from events such as crimes or disasters that could bring danger, injury, or damage to the general public. Although

addressing crime is typically considered a governmental responsibility (police, fire, and emergency services), it can also be reduced through environmental design using crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles.

<b>COMMUNITY: OKLAHOMA CITY</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Oklahoma City’s crime prevention and intervention efforts are based on best practices and measurably contribute to low crime rates throughout the city.	Goal 3: Police, p. II-171
<b>POLICY</b>	Design a Safe City. - We will incorporate crime prevention principles into the City’s design regulations and guidelines.	Initiative 1, p. 296
<b>ACTION</b>	Incorporate Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles into citywide design standards for development and redevelopment of public and private projects. CPTED principles include: 1) Territorially—physically define spaces as public or private and the appropriate use is obvious even to outside observers; 2) Access Control—deny access to soft targets; 3) Natural Surveillance—make it easy to observe all users of/in a particular territory/space; 4) Maintenance and Management—ensure equipment is functioning (lights, gates, etc.), landscape is kept neat especially to preserve surveillance.	Policy SE-1, p. 406

<b>COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	All Nashville residents have a choice of vibrant, safe, and healthy neighborhoods across many different communities and contexts.	BE Goal 1, p. II-170
<b>POLICY</b>	Encourage the development, redevelopment, or improvement of property, buildings, and landscapes to promote safety and reduce opportunities for crime.	BE Policy 1.3, p. II-170
<b>ACTION</b>	Mid-term (4–6 years): Conduct a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) audit on five (5) randomly selected, recently approved developments to gauge how well CPTED principles are incorporated into site design and identify any opportunities to better incorporate CPTED principles without lessening the contextual relationships with surrounding development. Consider amending land development regulations, building codes, or the site development process to strengthen the use of CPTED principles. Implementers: Metro Police, Metro Codes, Metro Planning, Private Sector.	BE Policy 1.3 Action, p. IV-48

**Best Practice**

**Plan for the mitigation and redevelopment of brownfields for productive uses:** A brownfield is defined by the federal government as any abandoned, idled, or underused real property where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by the presence or potential presence of environmental contamination. Redevelopment of these sites requires an environmental

assessment to determine the extent of contamination and to develop remediation strategies. The feasibility of site cleanup, market forces, and other factors may help define appropriate reuse options, which range from open space to mixed use development. Reusing brownfield sites returns underutilized land to productive use and reduces pressure to develop greenfield sites.

**COMMUNITY: CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Improved Environmental Quality - Continue to support projects that improve the quality of built and natural environments to support a thriving community and to reduce disparate health and environmental impacts, especially to low-income and disadvantaged communities. Clean air, water and soil, and a healthy ecosystem are critical for human development and contribute to reduced toxic exposure, incidence of disease, and environmental degradation.	Goal HW9, p. 11.17
<b>POLICY</b>	Toxic and Contaminated Sites - Continue to work with the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote the clean-up and reuse of contaminated sites to protect human and environmental health. Work with property owners and regional agencies to prevent, reduce or eliminate soil and water contamination from industrial operations, the Port and other activities that use, produce or dispose of hazardous or toxic substances. Implement appropriate mitigation measures and clean-up of sites that are known to contain toxic materials as a condition of reuse.	Policy HW9.2, p. 11.50
<b>ACTION</b>	Site Remediation - Require property owners to comply with and pay for state and federal requirements for site remediation as a condition for approving redevelopment on contaminated sites. In collaboration with other government agencies, utilize the Department of Toxic Substance Control Cortese List to prioritize the remediation of city and non-city-owned property to protect human and environmental health. Seek state and federal funds to implement the necessary level of clean-up.	Action HW9.J, p. 11.50

**COMMUNITY: WASHINGTON, D.C.**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>GOAL</b>	Protect, restore, and enhance the natural and man-made environment in the District of Columbia, taking steps to improve environmental quality, prevent and reduce pollution, and conserve the values and functions of the District's natural resources and ecosystems.	Environmental Protection Goal, p. 6-2
<b>POLICY</b>	Ensure that the necessary steps are taken to remediate soil and groundwater contamination in the city, both in areas where future development is likely and in areas that are already fully developed. In addition, require soil and groundwater evaluations for any development that is proposed on a site where contamination may be possible due to past activities. Depending on the site, it may also be necessary to investigate the effects of contamination on air quality, surface water, or river sediments, or to conduct an ecological risk assessment. If contamination is found to be above acceptable levels, require remediation and, where necessary, long term monitoring and institutional controls.	Policy E-4.4.5, p. 6-36
<b>ACTION</b>	Complete the hazardous substance response plan required under the District's Brownfields Act, and update the water pollution control contingency plan, as required under the District's Water Pollution Control Act.	Action E-4.4.F, p. 6-8

**Best Practice**

**Plan for physical activity and healthy lifestyles:** A healthy lifestyle is characterized by individual practices and behavioral choices that enhance health and well-being. Barriers to the design of the physical environment can

influence rates of physical activity and health benefits. Active transportation facilities (e.g., sidewalks and bike lanes) and accessible, equitably distributed recreational opportunities support physical activity and healthy lifestyles.

<b>COMMUNITY: ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	To provide an integrated recreation and open space system for Alachua County.	Recreation Element Goal 1, p. 320
<b>POLICY</b>	Develop and maintain an enhanced system of activity-based and resource-based recreational facilities that consist of a broad range of developed and protected sites and programmed recreation that is integrated by service area throughout the County from the neighborhood to the regional scale and accessible to all residents of Alachua County.	Objective 1.1, p. 320
<b>ACTION</b>	The County shall adopt and maintain, at a minimum, the following level of service standards for recreation: (1) 0.5 acres of improved activity-based recreation sites per 1,000 persons in the unincorporated area of Alachua County; (2) 5.0 acres of improved resource-based recreation sites per 1,000 persons in the unincorporated area of Alachua County. The level of service standards shall consider the location of the site and the population within the service areas for the park types, as set forth in Table 1 of this Element. The level of service standards shall account for changes in population due to annexation. The level of service standards shall include County-funded or County-developed facilities that are operated by other jurisdictions and shall include facilities provided by other entities for which Alachua County has cooperative use agreements.	Policy 1.1.2, p. 320

<b>COMMUNITY: ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	St. Louis Park is committed to providing a variety of options for people to make their way around the City comfortably, safely and reliably. - Continuing to expand the network of sidewalks, trails, and bike facilities.	Strategic Priorities, p. 1-2
<b>POLICY</b>	Promote healthy living through the use of park and open spaces for active and passive recreation, organized sports, picnic facilities, and environmental programs, youth and adult leagues and programs, and special events for all ages, abilities, and cultural backgrounds.	Recreation Goal 1, p. 61
<b>ACTION</b>	Evaluate and plan for the future demand for available youth and adult park areas. Offer new ideas and facilities that will provide the opportunity to expand entertainment programming, athletic leagues, cultural and artistic opportunities, family schedule-friendly programs, healthy lifestyle/holistic classes, and community-wide special events.	Strategy 1-D, p. 61

<b>COMMUNITY: MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Provide more opportunities for residents to exercise and have healthy lifestyles. - The county's built environment is intrinsically linked with the ability of its residents to lead healthy lives. All county residents need access to the things that keep us fit—such as healthy food and places to exercise.	Sustainable Places, p. 52
<b>POLICY</b>	The county will ... expand opportunities to walk, ride, bicycle, boat, and exercise in county parks while connecting to adjoining parks and facilities.	p. 52
<b>ACTION</b>	The county will: - Explore adding loop trails or trail extensions to county parks. - Add fitness stations and equipment where suitable. - Take advantage of the unique geography of county parks when opportunities arise.	p. 52

**HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado**

The Sheridan HIA called for community members to explore a shared/joint use approach of recreational resources and facilities.

**Best Practice**

**Provide accessible parks, recreation facilities, greenways, and open space near all neighborhoods:**

Parks are areas of land—often in a natural state or improved with facilities for rest and recreation—set aside for the public’s use and enjoyment. Greenways are strips of undeveloped land that provide corridors for environmental and recreational use and connect areas of open space. These facilities offer a range of benefits to

residents, including opportunities for increased physical activity. The proximity of parks to neighborhoods supports increased physical activity among residents; however, social and environmental impediments such as crime, unsafe pedestrian conditions, and noxious land uses may decrease accessibility and subsequent use of these facilities. Plans should ensure that the type of park and its function and design are appropriate for its locational context.

<b>COMMUNITY: CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	An Integrated System of Parks, Green Streets, and Trails - Develop strategies that will expand the system of large and small open spaces and community facilities linked together along natural creek channels, pedestrian-friendly green streets, and multimodal corridors from the hills to the bay. Coordinate park development and upgrades with pedestrian and bicycle improvements to safely and comfortably connect residents to valuable recreational destinations. Create a system of parks that equitably serves diverse community needs, offers a range of park types, facilities, and activities, and highlights natural features wherever possible. Provide more transit opportunities to improve access to parks and recreation facilities.	Goal PR1, p. 10.24
<b>POLICY</b>	Equitable Distribution of Park and Recreation Facilities - Expand park and recreation opportunities in all neighborhoods and ensure that they are offered within comfortable walking distance of homes, schools, and businesses in order to encourage more physically and socially active lifestyles. Continue to implement the parkland development standard of three acres of community or neighborhood parkland per 1,000 population in each neighborhood planning area. This represents a minimum provision which should be exceeded whenever possible. In established neighborhoods where land availability for new large parks is limited, prioritize improvement and maintenance of compact parks, play lots, and plazas to increase access to recreation opportunities for residents. Encourage developers to meet the City’s park development standard within their proposed development projects.	Policy PR1.3, p. 10.27
<b>ACTION</b>	Community Access and Mobility Criteria - Develop access and mobility criteria for capital improvement projects and new development to enhance physical access to community facilities, schools, parks, shoreline open spaces, historical destinations, commercial and employment centers, and transit hubs. The criteria should address access by walking, bicycling and public transit as well as vehicular access (p. 10.29) - The community access and mobility criteria should: • ensure safe connections to large and small open spaces, community facilities such as schools, community centers, recreational facilities, cultural and enrichment centers, historical destinations, transit hubs, and commercial and employment centers; • address travel routes, infrastructure improvement needs and barriers such as roads, railroad lines, freeways, fences, and natural features; and • provide bicycle and pedestrian-friendly routes including completion of major trails and pathways like the San Francisco Bay Trail and Richmond Greenway	Action PR1.A, p. 10.29

<b>COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	All communities in Nashville enjoy equally high levels of environmental protection, equitable access to nature, and opportunities to improve their health and quality of life.	NR Goal 2, p. II–241
<b>POLICY</b>	Increase access to recreational opportunities that distinguish Nashville, improve quality of life, and support the local economy.	NR Policy 2.2, p. II–241
<b>ACTION</b>	Near term (1–3 years): Build projects connecting Nashvillians to nature and parks where accessibility gaps exist. These include areas where parks and green space are currently lacking, as well as neighborhoods that have a disproportionate amount of noxious uses, or those that have been simply overlooked as Nashville has grown. Implementers: Metro Parks, Metro Public Works.	NR Policy 2.2 Action, p. IV–72

**HIA Application: Oklahoma City**

Recommendations from the *planoc* HIA call for expanding the number of parks and recreation centers, coordinating with schools to encourage access to recreation facilities, and increasing the connectivity to these spaces by improving sidewalks, trails and bike paths.

**Best Practice**

**Plan for access to healthy, locally grown foods for all neighborhoods:**

A lack of access to fresh, healthy foods contributes to obesity and negative health outcomes. In many urban areas, residents face difficulties in buying affordable or good-quality fresh food, a situation commonly referred to as a “food desert.” Healthy foods include those that are fresh or minimally

processed, naturally dense in nutrients, and low in fat, sodium, and cholesterol. Locally grown goods are those produced in close proximity to consumers in terms of both geographic distance and the supply chain. Though there is no standard definition of locally grown, sources can range from backyards and community gardens to farms within the region or state.

<b>COMMUNITY: CINCINNATI</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Become a healthier Cincinnati. - The good physical health of our residents encourages future growth by creating relationships and developing a greater quality of life. Cincinnati seeks to develop a culture of health embodied by thriving residents, not merely by absence of disease	Sustain Goal 1, p. 181
<b>POLICY</b>	Make sustainable access to and use of fresh, healthy food a priority in all neighborhoods.	Strategy 1-C, p. 190
<b>ACTION</b>	Eliminate Food Deserts in Cincinnati. Providing access to fresh, healthy foods will help eliminate Food Deserts. - Short-range (1–3 years): Identify clean vacant or underutilized property suitable for community gardens and urban farming opportunities in places where there are currently food deserts such as low-income and other under-served neighborhoods. - Mid-range (4–7 years): Assess and revise codes to allow for rooftop farming. - Long-range (8–10 years): Provide access to fresh produce within a 0.5-mile or 15-minute walk or ride by car or public transit from all residential areas.	p. 190–191

<b>COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	Nashville promotes the safety and wellness of its residents, workers, and visitors.	BE Goal 2, p. II–171
<b>POLICY</b>	Ensure all neighborhoods have healthy food options—including locally grown food—particularly neighborhoods with low levels of car ownership.	BE Policy 2.4, p. II–171
<b>ACTION</b>	- Ongoing: Expand gardening options in suburban communities. Use resource agencies to connect landowners to those wanting to grow food, often in exchange for a share of the produce. Implementers: Private sector, Community Garden Leaders. - Near term (1–3 years): Provide additional financial and planning support for the Nashville Farmers Market as the central hub for local food activity. Continue to diversify offerings to include more dairy, meat, fish, and bakery vendors. Incorporate the Nashville Farmers Market in planning as new development and attendant residential/commercial/government office redevelopment occurs nearby to promote the Farmers Market’s evolution and sustainability. Implementers: Nashville Farmers Market, Farmers and Vendors, Metro Council, Metro Health, Metro Planning. - Mid-term (4–6 years): Analyze barriers to entry for areas underserved by essential retail to identify necessary steps to improve access. A special focus should be on retail such as grocery stores that can improve quality of life for residents and catalyze additional private-sector investment. Based on the studies, create an ongoing program to incentivize these essential retail and services. Implementers: MPC, Metro Council.	BE Policy 2.4 Action, p. IV–50

**Best Practice**

**Plan for equitable access to health care providers, schools, public safety facilities, and arts and cultural facilities:**

Equitable access ensures services and facilities are reachable by all persons, regardless of social or economic background. Health-care providers are those individuals, institutions, or agencies that provide health-care services to consumers. Schools

are institutions that provide education or instruction. Public safety facilities provide safety and emergency services to a community, including police and fire protection. Arts and cultural facilities provide programs and activities related to the arts and culture, including performing arts centers, concert halls, museums, galleries, and other related facilities.

<b>COMMUNITY: CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	<p>Healthy and Viable Neighborhoods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creating healthy and viable neighborhoods that provide safe places for people of all ages, ethnicities, and abilities to live, work, and play. Equitably distribute community facilities, urban parks, and small public gathering areas to provide all residents with opportunities to enjoy the benefits of a rich social and physical environment. Further support residents' daily needs requiring small-scale local retail and other neighborhood-supporting uses within walking distance of homes. Encourage development of neighborhood nodes that increase convenient access to local services and amenities.</li> </ul>	Goal LU2, p. 3.46
<b>POLICY</b>	<p>Equitable Distribution and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue to promote equitable distribution of community facilities and infrastructure. Community facilities should continue to be located near residents in order to serve as neighborhood centers and maximize use. As Richmond grows, facilities will be sited to accommodate current and future residents. Prioritize the development of new, upgraded, or revitalized parks; community facilities such as libraries, medical centers, and schools; circulation and safety improvements; and infrastructure in neighborhoods that are currently underserved, have a high proportion of low-income households, and are impacted due to high crime and physical blight. Tailor improvements to the specific needs of residents in these neighborhoods.</li> </ul>	Policy LU2.4, p. 3.56
<b>ACTION</b>	<p>Neighborhood Revitalization Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop revitalization plans for all neighborhoods. Collaborate with community leaders and organizations, neighborhood councils, and neighboring jurisdictions to develop the plans. Identify needed improvements, funding mechanisms, and a phasing plan. Actively work to reduce blight throughout the City and promote the upkeep of vacant lots.</li> </ul>	Action LU2.A, p. 3.57
<b>COMMUNITY: CINCINNATI</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>GOAL</b>	<p>Become a healthier Cincinnati.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The good physical health of our residents encourages future growth by creating relationships and developing a greater quality of life. Cincinnati seeks to develop a culture of health embodied by thriving residents, not merely by absence of disease .</li> </ul>	Sustain Goal 1, p. 181
<b>POLICY</b>	<p>Decrease mortality and chronic and acute diseases.</p>	Strategy 1-B, p. 187
<b>ACTION</b>	<p>Increase access to health care. The most important factor to diagnosing and treating disease is access to quality health care. With the abundant exceptional hospitals and research facilities we have in Cincinnati, our residents will all have ready access to health care. We will develop strategies to decrease the number of people suffering from chronic and acute disease and decrease the infant mortality rate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Short-range (1–3 years): Identify locations where there is a lack of access to health care and seek the establishment of federally qualified health centers in those locations.</li> <li>- Long-range (8–10 years): Maintain or reopen City Health Clinics in locations lacking access to health care.</li> </ul>	p. 188–189

## Authentic Participation

**Ensure that the planning process actively involves all segments of the community in analyzing issues, generating visions, developing plans, and monitoring outcomes.**

### Best Practice

**Engage stakeholders at all stages of the planning process:** Engaging stakeholders throughout the planning process—from creating a community vision to defining goals, principles, objectives, and action steps, as well as in implementation and evaluation—is important

to ensure that the plan accurately reflects community values and addresses community priorities and needs. In addition, engagement builds public understanding and ownership of the adopted plan, leading to more effective implementation.

## COMMUNITY: MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

### MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

### CITATION

#### APPROACH

#### Fall 2013: Steering Committee

p. 2

The county commissioners and MCPC Board appointed a Steering Committee to oversee *Montco 2040: A Shared Vision*.

#### Fall 2013–Winter 2014: Public Outreach – Input on Issues

- Public survey made available
  - Over 2,500 surveys were completed. The top issues respondents wanted the county to address were retaining businesses, repairing local roads/bridges, addressing aging water/sewer infrastructure, and reducing traffic congestion.
- Public workshops held
  - Four public workshops focused on issues identified in Montgomery County Today were held around the county. More than 150 people attended these workshops. In a money allocation exercise, participants gave the most money to transportation and economic development.
- Other public input encouraged
  - Public input was also gathered online, with additional meetings to community groups, and through social media.

#### Winter 2014: Public Outreach – Comments on Draft Goals

- Themes and goals for the plan drafted
  - Using public input as a guide, the Steering Committee drafted themes and goals, which were then shared with the public, local municipalities, school districts, and other stakeholders for their comment and input.

#### Spring–Fall, 2014: Public Outreach – Comments on Draft Plan

- Implementation steps and recommendations prepared, followed by public meetings
  - Following adjustments of the draft goals to reflect public comment, the Steering Committee prepared implementation steps that identify what will be done, who will do it, and how it will be measured. This draft plan was shared with the public for their input and discussed at four public workshops and numerous other meetings around the county.

**COMMUNITY: CINCINNATI**

	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Steering Committee</b> Over the course of the three-year <i>Plan Cincinnati</i> process, the Steering Committee met approximately 25 times, and guided <i>Plan Cincinnati</i> through many renditions to its current state.</p> <p><b>Community Information Sessions</b> The next step began in the summer of 2009 with visits to all Community Councils to explain the purpose of a comprehensive plan and advertise the first round of public meetings. (p. 57)</p> <p><b>2010 Neighborhood Summit</b> The Neighborhood Summit is a meeting held each year for community members and organizations in Cincinnati to discuss current issues and upcoming projects. With approximately 600 people in attendance each year, the Neighborhood Summit was the perfect forum for in-depth discussion and deliberation about <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>.</p> <p><b>Working Group Meeting One</b> The first round of working group meetings were held in May and June 2010 and were intended to give all participants common baseline knowledge about each of the 12 Elements.</p> <p><b>Summer Learning Forums</b> In the summer months of 2010, Working Group members left their small groups and joined together to attend a series of panel discussions providing information about important local and regional initiatives that would impact the work of <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>.</p> <p><b>Working Group Meeting Two</b> In September and October 2010, the Working Groups met for their second round of meetings, and participants received a data and information profile specific to their Working Group's individual requests. The Working Groups discussed the implications of the data on the preliminary goals and whether the goals were still valid. In many cases, the Working Groups altered the Goals or added new ones.</p> <p><b>The Working Group Open House</b> In February 2011, the work that all of the Working Groups had completed thus far, consisting of a total of 126 goals, was presented to the community at a public Open House. Community members were able to see all of the proposed goals in one place, along with maps and graphics used by each Working Group when making decisions, and were asked to comment on the work done so far.</p> <p><b>2011 Neighborhood Summit</b> The 2011 Neighborhood Summit was another opportunity to gather several hundred community members together to further <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>.</p> <p><b>Draft Plan Open House</b> In March 2012, the draft of <i>Plan Cincinnati</i> was presented to the public in the form of an Open House. The public, as well as other City departments, were asked to review and comment on the draft Plan, to prioritize the Action Steps and their proposed timetable, and to suggest additional implementation partners. Approximately 220 people attended the Open House, and others viewed the Draft Plan on the <i>Plan Cincinnati</i> website.</p> <p><b>Plan Adoption Public Hearings</b> On Monday, November 19, 2012, the Livable Communities Committee of City Council held a public hearing to approve <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>, and on Wednesday, November 21, 2012, the Cincinnati City Council adopted <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>.</p>	p. 57–63

**HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado**

In the Sheridan HIA, recommendations were presented to the Sheridan Planning Commission and City Council and HIA task force at a study session to gain guidance on the applicability of the recommendations and the appropriateness of the recommendations for the Sheridan community. A website was also developed to disseminate the initial recommendations and to solicit feedback.

**Best Practice**

**Seek diverse participation in the planning process:**

A robust comprehensive planning process engages a wide range of participants across generations, ethnic groups, and income

ranges. Especially important is reaching out to groups that might not always have a voice in community governance, including representatives of disadvantaged and minority communities.

**COMMUNITY: PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

**MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS**

**CITATION**

**APPROACH**

**Residents, Business and Landowners, Neighborhood Organizations, Interest Groups, and Other Stakeholders**

Participation Plan, p. 3–4

This Public Participation Plan includes outreach efforts to engage a wide variety of stakeholders, including residents, business and landowners, interest groups, development and conservation entities, chambers of commerce, and others. As youth, homebound seniors, younger families and non-English speaking minorities are usually less likely to attend organized meetings for a variety of reasons, the County will reach out to these groups in appropriate ways by attending and participating in community events, through electronic media contact, and visits to social meetings and gatherings.

**Stakeholder Management**

Pima County staff will compile and monitor a list of stakeholders, both external and internal to Pima County, to determine whether targeted outreach efforts are appropriate. Meetings and community events can also be requested by members of the public. Staff will work with the interested parties (neighborhood groups, business or trade groups, social service entities) to attend and engage with the group during the Comprehensive Plan Initiative.

**COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE**

**MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS**

**CITATION**

**APPROACH**

NashvilleNext encouraged engagement of all Nashville/Davidson County constituents, while at the same time focusing on specific and hard-to-reach groups in order to bring them into the process.

p. 1–35, 1–50

**Community Engagement Committee**

The Community Engagement Committee served as community engagement advisers for the NashvilleNext process and as “guardians” of the engagement process to ensure that the goals of the engagement process are being met. The Engagement Committee provided guidance on best practices in reaching hard-to-reach constituents, reviewing community engagement reports, and making recommendations as needed.

**Demographics of NashvilleNext participants**

Whenever possible, NashvilleNext participants were asked demographic information. This allowed the planning team to see who participated, so that gaps in participation could be addressed. Throughout each phase of NashvilleNext, the Community Engagement Committee, staff, and consultants monitored progress in reaching all Nashvillians. As gaps in participation and problems in outreach were identified, these groups worked to find new ways of connecting to these communities to bring them into the process.

- Focus groups were also held with especially hard-to-reach groups. These allowed staff to hear from these communities directly. Their numbers are small compared to all participants, but provided detailed, in-depth comments. While some gaps remain, overall, NashvilleNext saw improved participation across phases. (p. 1–50)

**COMMUNITY: ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA**

**MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS**

**CITATION**

**APPROACH**

**Neighborhood Referral System**

Policy 7.1.27, p. 128

A Neighborhood Referral System will enable representative neighborhood organizations to review and comment on land use and development cases prior to planning and zoning decisions made at public hearings by expanding the notification procedures to include neighborhood organizations. Representative neighborhood organizations will also provide a link to County government for educational and service provisions.

**COMMUNITY: OKLAHOMA CITY**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Presentation Circuit</b> City planners spoke to various professional, nonprofit, and neighborhood groups to introduce <i>planokc</i> and share ways they could be involved. The Presentation Circuit reached approximately 50 groups and over 1,300 people.</p> <p><b>Healthy Communities Oversight Group</b> This group was charged with helping ensure that the goals and policies in <i>planokc</i> were consistent with the city's public health objectives. This group was primarily composed of public health experts and individuals working to understand the connections between health and the built environment, with the end goal of planning for a healthier community, economy, and environment.</p> <p><b>Citizen Advisory Team</b> The Citizen Advisory Team was a 27-member, Mayor-appointed group that provided advice at key points in the planning process, responding to the work done by planners and stakeholder groups. Members represented a cross-section of interests in the community, including representatives from each of the eight citizen stakeholder groups, the Healthy Communities Oversight Group, the development sector, public schools, and the community at large. Each ward was represented by a member of the Planning Commission or City Council.</p> <p><b>Community Surveys</b> Using a variety of surveying techniques was essential to reaching the widest audience possible.</p>	p. 21, 24

**COMMUNITY: CINCINNATI**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Planting the Future – Engaging ages 5–18</b> Beginning in July 2010, Planning staff held a special event for Cincinnati's youth called Planting the Future in which over 600 local students from grades K-12 provided input to <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>. ... To reach this population, a program was designed based on the art therapy concept. Planting the Future week, July 26–30, 2010, kicked off the program, and five additional events were conducted in the months of September and October, 2010. - The unprecedented success of Planting the Future events led to expansion of the program to senior citizens. Four events were conducted in May 2011, where more than 50 senior citizens participated in the program painting their concerns and fears along with their hopes and dreams for the City of Cincinnati.</p> <p><b>Investing in the Future – Engaging ages 18–25</b> From March to June 2011, Planning staff identified the 18–30 year olds as an additional population that was difficult to reach and therefore lacking in participation. A special course was held at the University of Cincinnati to engage the youth once again. ... it allowed students to write their own chapter for <i>Plan Cincinnati</i>.</p>	p. 59–60, 62

**COMMUNITY: KAUAI COUNTY, HAWAII**

	MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS	CITATION
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Elementary School Outreach</b> Keiki Art Contest: More than 300 entries were received for an elementary school level Keiki Art Contest that ran from April 1 to May 22, 2015. Twelve public and private schools across the island participated, and winners were announced in June 2015. The theme was "I Love My Community Because ..." Entries demonstrated what keiki treasure about Kaua'i today and what they would like to see in the future.</p> <p><b>Middle School &amp; High School Outreach</b> Middle School Planning Curriculum: The County Planning Department began working with The Learning Coalition in Honolulu and the State Department of Education in the fall of 2015 to develop a classroom curriculum about Community Planning, including the General Plan. As part of this effort, an instructor at Chiefess Kamakahelei Middle School formed a Junior Planner Club. County Planning Department Staff made presentations to the club and engaged them in an activity on this General Plan process.</p>	p. 314, 316

**Best Practice**

**Promote leadership development in disadvantaged communities through the planning process:** Leaders and respected members of disadvantaged communities can act as important contacts and liaisons for planners in order to engage and empower community members

throughout the planning process. Participation in the process can encourage development of emerging leaders, especially from within communities that may not have participated in planning previously.

**COMMUNITY: OKLAHOMA CITY**

MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

CITATION

**APPROACH**

**Meeting in a Box**

Meeting in a Box was a self-guided activity that allowed citizens to host their own *planokc* meeting to discuss 10 livability indicators, rate their neighborhood based on their discussion, identify the importance of each indicator, and report back to *planokc* staff.

p. 21

**COMMUNITY: PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

CITATION

**APPROACH**

**Volunteer-based Nonprofit Groups**

Pima County community development and faith-based initiatives staff will help identify key stakeholder groups and community leadership as well as engage them in the process. These organizations may also assist with the dissemination of materials and information to their members and contacts.

Participation Plan, p. 4

**Best Practice**

**Develop alternative scenarios of the future:** Scenario planning is a technique in which alternative visions of the future are developed based upon different policy frameworks and development patterns, allowing

communities to envision the consequences of “business as usual” as compared to changed development strategies. Comparing scenarios helps to frame choices and inform community decision making during the planning process.

<b>COMMUNITY: KAUAI COUNTY, HAWAII</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Community Place-Typing and Visioning Workshops (November 2015 and April 2016)</b></p> <p>Community members were asked at the beginning and end of the workshop to confirm whether or not this place type was accurate to describe the community today. They were also asked whether the community would remain as it is today, or undergo a transition. This future change was articulated as each community’s “degree of change.” Determining degree of change helps to articulate how much change is appropriate in different places on Kaua’i in order to achieve the visions for each community on the island.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three degrees of change were identified in the <i>Kaua’i General Plan</i> workshops to describe community visions: Minimal Change, for a place that is maintained; Incremental Change, for a place that allows for change over time and evolves; Transformative Change, for a place that encourages significant change to occur.</li> <li>- The findings formed the basis of Place Typing and Community Vision memos, and preliminary land-use maps for each district that were further refined during this General Plan process.</li> </ul>	p. 308–309

<b>COMMUNITY: NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Phase IV: Making Policy Decisions, Alternate Future</b></p> <p>Alternate Futures : The three futures—Business as Usual, Centers With Adjacent Infill, and Downtown &amp; Pikes—showed different ways Nashville could grow in the future by looking at how and where new homes and jobs could be accommodated, as well as the infrastructure and transportation system needed to support that growth. These three potential futures reflected the input gathered in the previous phase, when participants described what to preserve or protect, and where growth should be focused.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each future was assessed based on how it addressed 12 issues, or outcomes, that represent the values of the public. The outcomes are tied to quantitative results from the future models, which were then reviewed by the NashvilleNext Resource Teams.</li> <li>- These results are consistent with earlier NashvilleNext results. They are also consistent with the in-depth discussions the seven focus groups, organized by the Tennessee Council on Developmental Disabilities, The Contributor, Safe Haven, Nashville International Center for Empowerment, FUTURO, the Tennessee Latin American Chamber of Commerce, and Catholic Charities.</li> </ul>	p. 1–47

**Best Practice**

**Provide ongoing and understandable information for all participants:**

Information available in multiple, easily accessible formats and languages is key to communicating

with all constituents, including non-English speakers. Such communication may involve translating professional terms into more common lay vocabulary.

**COMMUNITY: OKLAHOMA CITY**

MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

CITATION

**APPROACH**

**Community Updates and Open Houses.**

p. 24

Several large community presentations were conducted to build awareness and inform residents on work completed.

**COMMUNITY: PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

CITATION

**APPROACH**

**Libraries**

Participation Plan, p. 4

Planning staff will work with the Pima County Library Director and staff to determine the best ways to distribute the information throughout the library system to make it accessible in hard copy, electronically, or both, as is most appropriate for each branch. For disadvantaged populations, it can also serve as a mechanism to provide equal access to the website, email and web-based Plan software for input. Libraries may also serve as public meeting places to discuss aspects of the Plan or the process for its creation.

**Best Practice**

**Use a variety of communications channels to inform and involve the community:** Communications channels that can be used throughout the planning process include

traditional media, social media, and internet-based platforms. Different constituencies may prefer to engage through different channels.

<b>COMMUNITY: PLANO, TEXAS</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>Announcements</b> The city sent public survey announcements to 82,000 residents through utility bills and delivered over 5,200 announcements to apartments. Ran an announcement in the <i>Dallas Morning News</i>.</p> <p><b>Telephone Town Hall</b> Made 40,000 calls through a telephone calling service for a telephone town hall meeting.</p> <p><b>Newsletter</b> In addition to posting meeting announcements on the project website, an active electronic newsletter with nearly 1,500 subscribers provides updates on the process of the plan.</p>	FAQ, p. 2

<b>COMMUNITY: KAUAI COUNTY, HAWAII</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p>Further, the use of digital platforms such as our website, email address, online survey, Facebook, and Instagram accounts helped to advertise events, provide a convenient forum to provide comments, and reach out to a younger audience.</p> <p><b>Social Media</b> Social media was utilized as an engagement tool throughout the project. Platforms included the Kauai County Planning Department’s Facebook page, and a dedicated Instagram account for this General Plan (@plankauai). An official hashtag was developed and promoted, #plankauai. As of February 2018, #plankauai had 181 Instagram followers and 670 Facebook fans.</p> <p><b>Videos</b> A three-minute informational video was produced to introduce the GP Update process, background, and history, content topics, importance to policy, and opportunities for public participation. The video included footage of Kauai and the public process, and was designed to raise awareness, promote the update process, and encourage public participation. It was posted on the project website, shared on social media, and screened at community meetings.</p> <p><b>Instagram Contests</b> Two community-wide Instagram contests were held for the GP Update. One coincided with Plan Kauai Pop-Up Week, and the second was launched during the Community Meetings. The first contest challenged users to find the <i>Plan Kauai</i> pop-up tent, talk with County planners, and post a photo with hashtags #findtheplanners and #planKauai. The second contest invited community members to post photos that represent their vision for Kauai and to tag #myKauaivision.</p>	Appendix B, p. 303–304, 311

<b>COMMUNITY: PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA</b>		
	<b>MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>	<b>CITATION</b>
<b>APPROACH</b>	<p><b>MindMixer</b> Pima County’s Mind Mixer site was launched in October of 2013 with seven initial questions; later an additional six were added. This site was meant to supplement the in-person community visits and stakeholder meetings in an attempt to reach the greatest number of people possible. - The site received more 350 active participants, 55 percent of which were female and 45 percent were male. In total, Mind Mixer participants provided 514 comments related to the County’s Comprehensive Plan Update.</p>	Appendix C, p. 14

**HIA Application: City of Sheridan, Colorado**

The Sheridan HIA created a website to disseminate the initial recommendations and to solicit feedback.

**Best Practice**

**Continue to engage the public after the comprehensive plan is adopted:** Stakeholder engagement should not end with the adoption of the comprehensive plan. An effective planning

process continues to engage stakeholders during the implementing, updating, and amending of the plan, so that the public remains involved with ongoing proposals and decisions.

**COMMUNITY: CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIFORNIA**

**MODEL LANGUAGE FROM COMPREHENSIVE PLANS**

**CITATION**

**APPROACH**

**Additional Housing Element Outreach after Adoption of the Richmond General Plan 2030**

After the City adopted the General Plan 2030 on April 24, 2012, the City began making further revisions to the Housing Element, incorporating State HCD feedback and soliciting further public participation. The City and its consultant team held stakeholder interviews and conducted two public workshops in order to continue to gather input for the Revised Draft Housing Element.

**Stakeholder Interviews**

The City invited more than 60 key stakeholders to participate in interview sessions. On May 30, 2012, the City conducted 15 stakeholder interviews with 18 people. These sessions provided an opportunity for stakeholders to provide input on a one-on-one basis. Interviews were conducted in person or on the telephone.

**Public Workshops**

The City conducted two additional public workshops to solicit input for the 2007–2014 Housing Element Update. The meetings included discussion regarding Housing Element requirements, the update process, and areas requiring further attention. All meetings were open to the public and provided opportunity for questions and comments. Translation services were provided for Spanish-speaking participants. Notification for the two public workshops was advertised in the *West County Times* newspaper. Project information and links were published on the City’s Housing Element webpage and the workshop dates were listed on the Planning Division’s Event Calendar online. In addition, the workshops were advertised twice in the City Manager’s Weekly Report, during programming breaks on KCRT Cable Television, and through weekly email event invites. Event invites were emailed three weeks prior to the first workshop and followed up with reminder emails.

Housing Element, p. 3

## CONCLUSION

The goal of this toolkit is to serve as guidance on how planners can use the principles and processes of APA's standards to elevate health and equity considerations into their own comprehensive plans. The toolkit focuses on the specific principles and processes related to health and equity: "Interwoven Equity" and "Healthy Community" principles, and the "Authentic Participation" process. The model language for "Best Practices" identified within these components were collected from the comprehensive plans of 15 communities across the United States and analyzed based on the specificity and action-orientation of policies. The most important aspect of this document is providing examples of specific language (model language) that these existing comprehensive plans have used to align with the Best Practices.

### Findings

The data collected for this toolkit revealed several key findings regarding the presence of the three components of comprehensive plan standards in the 15 selected plans examined. Overall, we collected a total of 125 model language examples across the three components.

The *Healthy Community* principle had a total of 51 model language examples, the highest number across the three components. The *Interwoven Equity* principle had a total of 42 model language examples, and the *Authentic Participation* principle had a total of 32 examples, the lowest number across the three components. These findings show that across the 15 communities, there is a greater propensity to include discussions regarding public health. Conversely, there is less of a propensity for the communities to include discussions regarding fairness and equity and public participation in the planning process.

### Healthy Community Principle

- Overall, there were 51 model language examples found across the seven Best Practices.
- The number of examples per Best Practice range from four to nine. Most of the Best Practices have seven or eight examples. On average, there were roughly seven (7.29) examples for each of the seven Best Practices. The Best Practice with the highest number of examples is "Plan for physical activity and healthy lifestyles."

### Interwoven Equity Principle

- Overall, there were 42 model language examples found across the nine Best Practices.
- The number of examples per Best Practice range from one to nine. Most of the Best Practices have four

examples. On average, there were roughly five (4.67) examples for each of the nine Best Practices. The Best Practices with the highest number of examples are "Provide a range of housing types" and "Plan for workforce diversity and development."

### Authentic Participation Process

- Overall, there were 32 examples found across the seven Best Practices.
- The number of examples per Best Practice range from one to eight. Most of the Best Practices have at least two examples. On average, there were roughly five (4.57) examples for each of the seven Best Practices. The Best Practice with the highest number of examples is "Engage stakeholders at all stages of the planning process."

### Recommendations

Based on the information collected from the existing comprehensive plans, we find that among all the best practices (that are of interest in this toolkit), the three that did not appear very often in the comprehensive plans reviewed were: 1) Plan for a jobs/housing balance, 2) Protect vulnerable populations from natural hazards, and 3) Continue to engage the public after the comprehensive plan is adopted. In the following discussion, we provide recommendations/strategies that planners can use to integrate these practices into their comprehensive plans in a more substantial manner.

### Interwoven Equity—plan for a jobs/housing balance

Recommendation: In 2003, APA released a PAS Report on jobs-housing balance that included a section on adopting jobs-housing balance policies in comprehensive plans (Weitz 2003). The step-by-step approach described involves four steps: understanding the role of the comprehensive plan; providing data to inform decision makers; setting goals and choosing principles; and ensuring policy consistency. General strategies include:

- Using the comprehensive plan's future land-use plan to guide the community's needs for new jobs and new housing units into a recommended pattern, mix, and intensity of land uses.
- Collecting data on existing employment and housing in the locality to understand what the current jobs-housing balance is in the community, as well as projected population, housing, and employment data

to determine future needs and demands. It is often the case that additional data are needed to compute jobs-housing ratios.

- Incorporating public participation processes involving local government leaders and citizens, with assistance from planners, to decide the mix of jobs, housing, and other land uses that they want in their community now and in the future.
- Verifying that all elements of the comprehensive plan work in tandem to achieve specific policies intended to balance jobs and housing and do not contradict job-housing balance as a goal.

### Specific land-use regulations that promote the integration of jobs-housing balance

Providing for mixed land uses	Permit accessory units or “garage apartments”	Permit live/work units
Consider revisions to the zoning map that will bring jobs closer to neighborhoods	Promote jobs-housing balance through home occupation regulations	Require or encourage planned unit developments to provide a mix of residences and employment that promotes jobs-housing balance
Inclusionary zoning	Linkage programs	Incentives

### Interwoven Equity—protect vulnerable populations from natural hazards

Recommendation: In 2010, APA released a [PAS Report](#) on hazard mitigation that included a chapter on integrating hazard mitigation throughout the comprehensive plan. Hazards can be addressed in state policies as well as part of a broader element dealing with related issues such as environmental quality, open space, or land use. The chapter provides a short list of other frequently used comprehensive plan elements that could potentially advance hazard mitigation goals and can be applied to vulnerable populations:

- *Housing.* Much public and publicly subsidized affordable housing is particularly vulnerable to certain natural hazards. In some cases, this is a question of building quality, but it can also be a matter of location. The plan can consider how housing can be retrofitted or replaced to reduce danger to inhabitants in the face of disaster.
- *Economic development.* Specific local policies regarding issues of crucial importance to business continuity can aid economic recovery, while technical assistance in support of hazard mitigation for vulnerable small businesses may keep some afloat in the face of disaster.

- *Recreation and open space.* Turning vulnerable floodplain land into open space or recreational areas can help avert or minimize damage to homes and businesses; parkland can absorb floodwater before it reaches homes and businesses.

### Authentic Participation—continue to engage the public after the comprehensive plan is adopted

Recommendation: In Austin, Texas, the planning process for the *Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan* (City of Austin 2012) incorporates continued public engagement during the implementing, updating, and amending of the plan.

- *Updating.* The *Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan* recognizes and embraces all previous master and small area plans. During future projected growth period, inconsistencies between *Imagine Austin* and other plans may be discovered. Changes to the master plans will be addressed through a public amendment process by the City Council. Changes to the small area plans (e.g., neighborhood plans) will continue to include public input from affected parties and will follow the adopted neighborhood plan amendment process. Changes to *Imagine Austin* should be addressed through the annual review.
- *Progress Review.* Regular evaluation and monitoring of the *Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan* is a key component of the implementation strategy. Ongoing monitoring will inform the City Council, Planning Commission, City of Austin administration and departments, partner organizations, and the public about the plan’s effectiveness; identify those aspects of implementation that are working well and those needing improvement; and keep the plan current as circumstances change and new information becomes available.
- *Monitoring.* The monitoring process provides a way to measure progress and get feedback from policy makers and the public to determine if the implementation program is working to achieve the *Imagine Austin* vision. Plan monitoring includes two primary components: annual program monitoring of recommended initiatives, programs, or regulatory changes; and longer-term performance monitoring using indicators to measure whether the recommended actions are achieving desired results.

Planners should focus more on these three Best Practices for comprehensive plans. The recommendations/strategies provided above are not exhaustive but rather provide a starting point for planners to begin thinking about how to incorporate these specific Best Practices into their comprehensive plans.

## REFERENCES

City of Austin, Texas Planning and Zoning Department. 2012. *Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan*. Available at [ftp://ftp.ci.austin.tx.us/npzd/ImagineAustin/IACP\\_2018.pdf](ftp://ftp.ci.austin.tx.us/npzd/ImagineAustin/IACP_2018.pdf)

Schwab, James C. (ed.). 2010. *Hazard Mitigation: Integrating Best Practices into Planning*. Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 560. Chicago: American Planning Association. Available at [https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1739-25045-4373/pas\\_560\\_final.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1739-25045-4373/pas_560_final.pdf)

Weitz, Jerry. 2003 *Jobs-Housing Balance*. Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Report 516. Chicago: American Planning Association. Available at [https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/publication/download\\_pdf/PAS-Report-516.pdf](https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/publication/download_pdf/PAS-Report-516.pdf)

## APPENDIX A

### Methodology

The following section explains the methodology used to select the comprehensive plans for the model language and the method used to collect information from these plans.

### Plan Selection

The following process informed APA's selection of the 15 comprehensive plans that were used to develop this toolkit.

We created a list of health-focused comprehensive plans using several sources. In 2010, APA released the *Healthy Planning* report, which evaluated 18 comprehensive and four sustainability plans from communities across the United States to assess the extent to which they included health goals, policies, and implementation mechanisms. In addition to these plans, the Health Impact Project compiled a collection of HIAs that had informed comprehensive plans. Moreover, professional experts from PA, Centers for Disease Control, and Health Impact Project also gave several recommendations of health-focused comprehensive plans. We also added comprehensive plans that had received APA's Daniel Burnham Award (the national planning award for best comprehensive plans). Out of this list, we eliminated plans adopted before 2010 and those that were neighborhood-focused. The following 15 comprehensive plans were selected for the analysis:

1. Alachua County, Florida (2011) \*
2. Baltimore County, Maryland (2010) ^
3. Cincinnati (2012) #
4. City of Richmond, California (2012) \* ^
5. City of Sheridan, Colorado (2015) \*
6. Douglas County, Minnesota (2011) \*
7. Kane County, Illinois (2012) ^
8. Kaua'i County, Hawaii (2018) #
9. Montgomery County, Pennsylvania (2015) ^
10. Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee (2017) #
11. Oklahoma City (2014) \*
12. Pima County, Arizona (2015) ^
13. Plano, Texas (2015) #
14. St. Louis Park, Minnesota (2018) \*
15. Washington, D.C. (2006) ^

(\*) = Communities with HIA

(^ ) = Recommended by experts

(#) = Recipient of APA's Daniel Burnham Award

A total of 15 comprehensive plans were selected for analysis: one region, eight counties, six cities.

### Plan Analysis

The data collection was focused on "Interwoven Equity" and "Healthy Community" principles, and "Authentic Participation" process, of the standards. The focus of this project was to identify and examine the Best Practices related to health and equity within these components. Best practices in support of these principles ranged across a wide spectrum of plan statements, policies, and actions. Best practices were selected based on the quality and level of detail with which the communities integrated them into their plans. Greater attention was placed on implementation actions.

The *Interwoven Equity* principle highlights the importance of equity in community decisions and services regarding the fair distribution of benefits and costs among the full range of the population served—rich and poor, young and old, native and immigrant. This principle emphasizes meeting the needs of poor, underserved, and minority populations who are often disproportionately affected and whose needs may fail to be recognized. There are seven Best Practices in support of the Interwoven Equity principle.

The *Healthy Community* principle highlights the importance of public health in communities in terms of complete physical, mental, and social well-being. This principle emphasizes assuring conditions in which people can be healthy and mitigating public health hazards. There are nine Best Practices in support of the Healthy Community principle.

The *Authentic Participation* process highlights the importance of public participation in the planning process through active involvement of the whole community in making and implementing plans, as well as influencing those actions that affect them. This process emphasizes going beyond the minimal legal requirements to connect with citizens through innovative communication and outreach strategies. There are seven Best Practices in support of the Authentic Participation process.

For each plan, data collection followed a two-step process:

1. Survey the Table of Contents: To reduce the exhaustive amount of data being reviewed, the plan's Table of Contents was used as a guide to determine which sections/plan elements to explore. Those most closely related to health, quality of life, and equity were given priority.
2. Keyword Search: To try and find any missing Best Practices that may have been overlooked, the plan's text was searched using the "Find" tool in either

Adobe Acrobat for those in PDF format or any internet browser for web-based plans.

3.

For the *Interwoven Equity* and *Health Community* principles, the model language examples were captured if the practice was 1) discussed in the goals and policies, but not in the implementation steps, and 2) discussed in the goals, policies, and implementation actions of the plan. However, the model language examples were excluded if the plan mentioned the Best Practice at a basic level and it was not addressed further in the plan policies, strategies, or implementation.

For the Authentic Participation process, the model language examples were captured if the process practice was 1) discussed to some degree in the plan, but with minimal supporting data, and 2) fully addressed and completely defined in the plan with supporting data. However, the model language examples were excluded if the plan mentioned the process practice but did not provide supporting data. (Based on *Sustaining Places* plan scoring criteria)

Excerpts of specific language (model language) that the selected comprehensive plans used to integrate the Best Practices were compiled and organized into three documents for each community based on the three components. Although some of the city-level comprehensive plans included individual neighborhood plans, model language was taken only from the citywide-related content.

Challenges encountered during the data collection process include PDF files of plans with content that was not searchable or not optimized for optical character recognition.

### Data Analysis

To determine which model language were the most representative of the Best Practices based on specificity and action-orientation of policies, all collected examples were reviewed and assessed. Data analysis occurred in two phases:

*By community.* To reduce and locate suitable Best Practice examples within each community, the model language collected for each plan was examined and analyzed for quality and level of detail. Potential examples were highlighted for further analysis.

*Across all communities.* To locate suitable Best Practice examples across all the communities, the potential examples from each community were compiled and organized into separate Best Practice documents for comparison. These documents were then reviewed, and at least two examples of model language were selected for each Best Practice. However, those Best Practices that only had one or two examples were automatically included. The findings were outlined in an Excel spreadsheet to maintain an inventory of the potential examples across the communities for each Best Practice.

During the second phase, three communities (Douglas County, Kane County, and Baltimore County) were eliminated from the study due to an insufficient total number of Best Practice model language (three or less). After data analysis was completed, additional Best Practice examples for the Authentic Participation process were included that were not part of the original data set as they were seen to be valuable and worth mentioning.

Challenges encountered during the data analysis include different framework/format of the plans and inconsistency of goal, policy, and action headings in plans. For example, goals would be listed as objectives, policies would be listed as initiatives/objectives/strategies, or actions would be listed as policies. In these instances, they were assessed on a case by case basis to determine how best to adjust the content to fit the goal, policy, action format of the model language. These changes are noted in the citations.

## APPENDIX B

### LINKS TO PLAN DOCUMENTS AND UPDATES AND HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

**Alachua County, Florida**

[Alachua County Comprehensive Plan 2011–2030](#). 2011.

**Baltimore County, Maryland**

[Master Plan 2020](#). 2010.

**Cincinnati**

[Plan Cincinnati](#). 2015.

**Douglas County, Minnesota**

[Douglas County Comprehensive Plan](#). 2011.

[Douglas County Comprehensive Plan Update: Health Impact Assessment](#). 2011.

**Kane County, Illinois**

[Kane County 2040 Plan: Healthy People, Healthy Living, Healthy Communities](#). 2012.

**Kaua'i County, Hawaii**

[Kauai County General Plan](#). (2018).

**Montgomery County, Pennsylvania**

[Montco 2040: A Shared Vision](#). 2015.

**Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee**

[NashvilleNext](#). 2017.

**Oklahoma City**

[planokc](#). 2015.

[planokc Comprehensive Plan: Health Impact Assessment](#). 2014.

**Pima County, Arizona**

[Pima Prospers](#). 2015.

**Plano, Texas**

[Plano Tomorrow](#). 2015, excerpt. Available at <http://www.planotomorrow.org>

**Richmond, California**

[Richmond General Plan 2030](#). 2012.

**Sheridan, Colorado**

[Sheridan Comprehensive Plan](#). 2015.

[Sheridan Comprehensive Plan: Health Impact Assessment, Full Report](#). 2015.

**St. Louis Park, Minnesota**

[2040 Comprehensive Plan](#). 2019.

[St. Louis Park Comprehensive Plan: Health Impact Assessment](#). 2011).

**Washington, D.C.**

[The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital](#). 2006.