

# STRATEGY BENEFITS AND STRATEGY FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENTS

---

**THE STRATEGY BENEFITS AND STRATEGY FEASIBILITY TABLES** included after each goal summarize the potential environmental, economic, and social benefits of each strategy as well as implementation costs, potential for payback or revenue, and communitywide financial impacts for each strategy. This analysis provides residents, stakeholders, City staff, and elected officials with an overall summary of the range of benefits and costs associated with each strategy and can be used to assist in identifying funding and implementation priorities.



## STRATEGY BENEFITS ASSESSMENT

The Strategy Benefits Table provides a ranking for each strategy found in the plan for six different benefit factors within three benefit categories.

BENEFIT FACTORS AND CATEGORIES	
ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS	
GHG REDUCTION POTENTIAL: The potential to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases	ECOSYSTEM HEALTH: The potential to enhance or protect ecosystems, ecosystem services, or biological diversity
ECONOMIC BENEFITS	
SELF-RELIANCE: The potential to support the growth and development of local resources, goods and services, and economy	HOUSEHOLD BENEFITS: The potential to enhance opportunities, services, or economic well-being for Lakewood households
SOCIAL BENEFITS	
COMMUNITY COHESION: The potential to foster supportive social networks, civic participation, and diversity	PUBLIC HEALTH: The potential to enhance physical or mental health of community members

BENEFIT FACTOR	RANKING METHOD	LOW	MED	HIGH
ECOSYSTEM HEALTH	Each strategy was assessed for its potential to directly or indirectly support nine objectives (found across each of the plan's chapters) that relate to ecosystem health. The results were ranked based on the number of objectives supported.	1-3 Objectives supported	4-6 Objectives supported	7-9 Objectives supported
SELF-RELIANCE	Each strategy was assessed for its potential to directly or indirectly support seven objectives (found across each of the plan's chapters) that relate to self-reliance. The results were ranked based on the number of objectives supported.	1-2 Objectives supported	3-5 Objectives supported	6-7 Objectives supported
HOUSEHOLD BENEFITS	Each strategy was assessed for its potential to directly or indirectly support eight objectives (found across each of the plan's chapters) that relate to household benefits. The results were ranked based on the number of objectives supported.	1-2 Objectives supported	3-5 Objectives supported	6-8 Objectives supported
COMMUNITY COHESION	Each strategy was assessed for its potential to directly or indirectly support eight objectives (found across each of the plan's chapters) that relate to community cohesion. The results were ranked based on the number of objectives supported.	1-2 Objectives supported	3-4 Objectives supported	5-6 Objectives supported
PUBLIC HEALTH	Each strategy was assessed for its potential to directly or indirectly support 12 objectives (found across each of the plan's chapters) that relate to public health. The results were ranked based on the number of objectives supported.	1-3 Objectives supported	4-6 Objectives supported	7+ Objectives supported

### GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION

#### (GHG) POTENTIAL:

An assessment was completed for each individual strategy to identify the potential GHG emissions reduction that would result from implementation. The potential emission reduction for each strategy is expressed in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO<sub>2</sub>e).

### BENEFIT FACTOR RANKINGS:

Each strategy was ranked and assigned a value of "Low," "Medium," "High," or "Not Applicable." The rankings were conducted as described above.

## STRATEGY FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENTS

The Strategy Feasibility Table provides a broad estimate of the costs associated with implementation of each strategy found in the plan along with an indication of whether the strategy will likely have ongoing costs, whether the strategy has the potential to pay for itself through cost saving or revenue generation, and whether the strategy provides a potential financial benefit or cost savings to Lakewood residents or the business community.

### UPFRONT COSTS:

Upfront costs were determined by estimating costs associated with staffing, supplies, technical equipment and software needs and whether the strategy included major capital improvements. The total estimated costs were then assigned a ranking based on the following structure:

\$ < 50,000    \$\$ = 50,000–100,000  
 \$\$\$ = 100,000–1,000,000    \$\$\$\$ > 1,000,000

### ONGOING COST:

Each strategy was assessed to determine whether there were ongoing costs associated with implementation.

### PAYBACK/POTENTIAL FOR REVENUE:

Each strategy was assessed to determine whether the City could expect to directly recoup implementation costs within a reasonable time frame.

### FINANCIAL BENEFITS FOR RESIDENTS:

Each strategy was assessed to determine whether implementation would likely result in household savings or other benefits related to household economics for Lakewood residents.

### FINANCIAL BENEFITS FOR BUSINESSES:

Each strategy was assessed to determine whether implementation would likely result in a reduction of expenses or potential increases in revenue for Lakewood businesses.

### UPFRONT COSTS MATRIX:

STAFF		CONSULTANT		SUPPLIES AND OTHER SERVICES		SOFT INFRASTRUCTURE		HARD INFRASTRUCTURE	
Salary & Wages: Assumes staff time of a City of Lakewood average salaried full-time employee (FTE)		Contract-Based: Assumes use of a consultant with technical expertise		Advertising, Postage, Printing, Training, Travel, Office Supplies, Software		Software Development, Web Development, Fees, Other Small Capital Improvements		Requires Construction or Major Capital Improvements	
High=FTE+ Med=.5FTE Low=.25FTE		\$100/hr							
High	\$60,000	High	\$75,000	High	\$20,000	High	\$50,000	High	\$10,000,000
Med	\$30,000	Med	\$50,000	Med	\$10,000	Med	\$25,000	Med	\$1,000,000
Low	\$15,000	Low	\$15,000	Low	\$5,000	Low	\$10,000	Low	\$100,000

# TARGET METHODOLOGY

---



	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: CCA1	REDUCE COMMUNITYWIDE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BY 20% BELOW 2017 LEVELS BY 2025.	Target was set based on the cumulative GHG emissions reduction potential of Plan strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2007 City of Lakewood Communitywide GHG Emission Inventory</li> <li>▪ Periodic communitywide GHG emission inventories</li> <li>▪ Assorted data sources detail in City of Lakewood GHG emission calculators</li> </ul>
	REDUCE COMMUNITYWIDE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS BY 50% BELOW 2007 LEVELS BY 2050.	Worldwide and national recommendations for levels necessary to avoid catastrophic impacts associated with climate change would establish this to be 80%. Based on 2025 goals and local limitations on control of energy generation and transmission, the target was set at 50%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2007 City of Lakewood CommunityWide GHG Emission Inventory</li> <li>▪ Periodic communitywide GHG emission inventories</li> <li>▪ Assorted data sources detailed in City of Lakewood GHG emission calculators</li> </ul>
	REDUCE MUNICIPAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS EACH YEAR THROUGH 2025.	It is important for the City to demonstrate leadership in efforts to reduce GHG emissions. The 2007 GHG Inventory did not provide data specific to Lakewood municipal operations. A specific reduction target should be established once the data is available.	Periodic municipal GHG emission inventories

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
<p>Customized GHG calculators developed for the City of Lakewood to track trends and cumulative GHG reductions</p>	<p>President's Climate Action Plan, June 2013 – Reduce U.S. GHG emissions by 17% by 2020 (2005 baseline)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Philadelphia – Reduce GHG emissions by 20% by 2015 (1990 baseline)</li> <li>■ Boston – Reduce GHG emissions by 25% by 2020 (2005 baseline)</li> <li>■ Houston – Reduce GHG emissions by 36% by 2016 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Vancouver – Reduce GHG Emissions by 33% by 2020 (2007 baseline)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Aurora – Reduce GHG emissions by 10% by 2025 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Denver – Reduce GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by 2020</li> <li>■ Ft. Collins – Reduce GHG emissions by 20% by 2020 (2005 baseline)</li> <li>■ Tacoma – Reduce GHG emissions by 40% by 2020 (1990 baseline)</li> <li>■ Evanston – Reduce GHG emissions by 17% by 2020 (2007 baseline)</li> </ul>
<p>Customized GHG calculators developed for the City of Lakewood to track trends and cumulative GHG reductions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement – Reduce communitywide GHG emissions by 80% by 2050</li> <li>■ STAR Communities – Reduce communitywide GHG emissions by 80% by 2050</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Austin – Net-zero communitywide GHG emissions by 2050</li> <li>■ Chicago – Reduce GHG emissions by 80% by 2050 (1990 baseline)</li> <li>■ Portland – Reduce GHG emissions by 80% by 2050 (1990 baseline)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Ft. Collins – Reduce GHG emissions by 100% by 2050 (2005 baseline)</li> <li>■ Tacoma – Reduce GHG emissions by 80% by 2050 (1990 baseline)</li> </ul>
<p>Customized GHG calculators developed for the City of Lakewood to track trends and cumulative GHG reductions</p>	<p>U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement – Reduce communitywide GHG emissions by 80% by 2050</p>	<p>Cleveland – Reduce municipal GHG emissions by 20% by 2020 (2010 baseline)</p>	<p>Ft. Collins – Reduce GHG emissions from municipal operations by 20% by 2020 (2005 baseline)</p>

	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: BE1	GENERATE 45% OF MUNICIPAL ENERGY FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES BY 2025.	State renewable energy portfolio standards require 30% of energy from renewable source by 2020. This target was established to encourage the City to secure an additional 15% of its energy from renewable sources by 2025.	Municipal energy bills and reports
	GENERATE 45% OF RESIDENTIAL ENERGY FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES BY 2025.	State renewable energy portfolio standards require 30% of energy from renewable source by 2020. This target was established to encourage Lakewood residents to secure an additional 15% of their energy from renewable sources by 2025.	Xcel annual community energy report, city building permit data
	GENERATE 45% OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ENERGY FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES BY 2025.	State renewable energy portfolio standards require 30% of energy from renewable source by 2020. This target was established to encourage Lakewood commercial and industrial entities to secure an additional 15% of their energy from renewable sources by 2025.	Xcel annual community energy report, city building permit data
GOAL: BE2	REDUCE MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND FACILITY ENERGY USE INTENSITY BY 30% BY 2025 <i>(Baseline: 2008-2010 normalized data)</i> .	Based on other communities and research on potential energy and cost savings from building efficiency improvements. Target was set above communitywide level to demonstrate leadership and because of the City's ability to control its energy use.	Municipal energy bills and reports
	REDUCE CITYWIDE BUILDING ENERGY USE INTENSITY BY 20% BY 2025 <i>(Baseline: 2007)</i> .	Based on targets from other communities and research on potential energy and cost savings from building efficiency improvements.	Xcel annual community energy report; Voluntary data from participants in benchmarking programs
	REDUCE CITYWIDE WATER USE BY 20% BY 2025 <i>(Baseline: 2007)</i> .	Based on targets from other communities and the Colorado Water Conservation Board's projection of 163 billion gallon shortfall for the state by 2050.	Denver Water and other local water provider consumption reports
GOAL: BE3	INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE OF CERTIFIED GREEN BUILDINGS EACH YEAR FROM 2015 TO 2025. <i>(new construction and renovations receiving occupancy permits)</i>	Green building certifications indicate community recognition of the value of resource efficiency and occupant health and well-being in building design. Recognizing that buildings can achieve these benefits without certification, no mandate or specific numeric target was set.	Green Globes, U.S. Green Building Council, Living Building Challenge

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
–	–	Orlando – 5% of municipal energy from renewable sources by 2017, 100% by 2030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – 50% of municipal energy from renewable sources by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Ft. Collins – Purchase 20% of energy from renewable sources by 2020 with 10% provided by on-site distributive energy</li> <li>■ Flagstaff – Increase renewable energy production to 50% of annual municipal energy consumption (long-term goal)</li> </ul>
Reported kwh generation from Xcel report and additional generation from sources not integrated into the grid (from permit data)	Star Communities – Increased number of renewable energy certificates (RECs) purchased by residents annually	San Diego – 100% electricity used in the City to be from renewable sources by 2035	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – 20% of communitywide energy from renewable sources by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Colorado Springs – 50% of Pike’s Peak energy from sustainable sources by 2030</li> <li>■ Denver – 50% of communitywide energy from renewable sources by 2020</li> </ul>
Reported kwh generation from Xcel report and additional generation from sources not integrated into the grid (from permit data)	–	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – 20% of communitywide energy from renewable sources by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Colorado Springs – 50% of Pike’s Peak energy from sustainable sources by 2030</li> <li>■ Denver – 50% of communitywide energy from renewable sources by 2020</li> </ul>
–	Star Communities – 80% reduction in energy use by selected public infrastructure by 2050	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Philadelphia – Lower city government energy consumption by 30% by 2015 (2008 baseline)</li> <li>■ Orlando – 10% reduction in municipal energy consumption by 2017, 50% by 2030</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – Reduce City energy consumption by 25% by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Denver – Reduce energy consumed in city-operated buildings and vehicles by 20% by 2020</li> <li>■ Ft. Collins – Reduce City energy consumption by 20% by 2020 (2005 baseline)</li> </ul>
–	Star Communities – 80% reduction of communitywide building energy use intensity by 2050	Philadelphia – Lower citywide building energy consumption by 10% by 2015 (2006 baseline)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – Reduce communitywide energy use by 20% by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Colorado Springs – Reduce Pike’s Peak regional energy use by 20% by 2030 (2010 baseline)</li> </ul>
–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Star Communities – 80% reduction of communitywide building water use intensity by 2050</li> <li>■ Denver Water – Reduce overall water use by 22% by 2016 (2002 baseline)</li> </ul>	Vancouver – Reduce per capita water consumption by 33% from 2006 levels by 2020.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – Reduce per capita water use by 15% by 2012 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Denver – Reduce per capita use of potable water in Denver by 22% by 2020 (2001 baseline)</li> </ul>
Sum of certified buildings according to each of the program’s certified projects maps	Star Communities – Increase percentage of buildings achieving certification in LEED, Green Globes, and Living Building Challenge programs	Vancouver – Require all buildings constructed from 2020 onward to be carbon neutral in operations.	Golden – 90% of all new construction and 50% of remodels are built to green building standards by 2017 (2007 baseline)

	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: SE1	INCREASE LOCAL FOOD ASSETS ANNUALLY THROUGH 2025 <i>(baseline to be established after the completion of Implementation Strategy SE1-A)</i> .	Subject to change after local food asset assessment is completed – Target reflects estimated opportunities in Lakewood based on recently adopted zoning ordinance facilitating urban agricultural production and sales.	To be established as part of implementation strategy
	ACHIEVE PARTICIPATION FROM 20 LOCAL BUSINESSES IN THE FIRST THREE YEARS OF IMPLEMENTING A GREEN BUSINESS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.	Based on number of participating and certified and businesses in Certifiably Green Denver's program and normalized to Lakewood based on number of commercial businesses.	To be established as part of implementation strategy
GOAL: SE2	INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS IN CDBG QUALIFIED NEIGHBORHOODS SPENDING LESS THAN 45% OF INCOME ON HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS TO 60% BY 2025.	The 45% of income on housing and transportation costs is based on recommendations from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Center for Neighborhood Technology.	Center for Neighborhood Technology Housing + Transportation Affordability Index
	INCREASE NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS ABOVE LIVING WAGE STANDARD BY 15% BY 2025, <i>(Baseline: 2010)</i> .	Increasing the percentage of those who meet the living wage standard (wage rate necessary to meet basic needs), allows workers to achieve financial independence and live where they work and has also been linked to employer benefits from decreased turnover, increased morale, and increased productivity.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Living Wage Calculator
	INCREASE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS WITHIN A DESIGNATED COMPLETE NEIGHBORHOOD BY 25% BY 2025.	Established as a key strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and support other sustainability goals. Target reflects recently adopted zoning ordinance facilitating high density around transit hubs and transportation corridors.	To be established as part of implementation strategy

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
Number of food hubs, community kitchens, farmers markets, community produce stands, community food composting facilities, community garden plots, and urban farms	Star Communities – Increase over the past three years in the amount of fresh food produced through local urban agriculture or sold through direct farm-to-consumer activities	Vancouver – Increase citywide and neighborhood food assets by a minimum of 50% over 2010 levels by 2020.	Denver – Grow and process at least 20% of the food purchased in Denver entirely within Colorado
–	–	Vancouver – Double the number of companies that are actively engaged in greening their operations over 2011 levels by 2020.	Breckenridge – Positive yearly growth trend of certified "green businesses"
–	Star Communities – 60% of Census block groups with households earning 80% AMI spend less than 45% on housing and transportation	–	Denver – At least 80% of neighborhoods in Denver are rated as affordable using the H+T Index while preserving the diversity of the neighborhoods
Use the formula included in the Star Community Index = local living wage X average household size X work hours per year	Star Communities – 90% of median household incomes meet or exceed the living wage standard	Corvallis – Living Wage Ordinance for City employees and contractors that service the city, adjusted each year based on consumer price index	–
–	Star Communities – Increased access and proximity to residents of diverse income levels and race/ethnicity to the community facilities, services, and infrastructure	Seattle – 45% of households in urban centers/villages	–

	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: ZW1	ACHIEVE A 60% COMMUNITYWIDE DIVERSION RATE BY 2025.	Based on Colorado Association for Recycling statewide diversion target and strong work group recommendations.	Hauler reports and/or waste characterization study
	ACHIEVE AN 80% DIVERSION RATE AT THE CIVIC CENTER BY 2025.	Established to demonstrate leadership and determined to be achievable based on existing programs (recycling, composting, green purchasing) and participation rates.	Hauler reports
	ACHIEVE INCREASED DIVERSION RATES FOR SPECIFIC MUNICIPAL FACILITIES <i>(to be established after the completion of Implementation Strategy ZW1-B).</i>	To be established as part of implementation strategy.	To be established as part of implementation strategy
	ACHIEVE A 90% DIVERSION RATE AT CITY OF LAKEWOOD EARTH DAY AND CIDER DAYS EVENTS.	Standard for zero waste event according to Zero Waste International Alliance.	Self and/or hauler reported
GOAL: ZW2	ACHIEVE A 60% RESIDENTIAL DIVERSION RATE BY 2025 <i>(single-family residences and complexes with eight units or fewer).</i>	Based on Colorado Association for Recycling statewide diversion target and strong work group recommendations.	Hauler reports and/or waste characterization study
GOAL: ZW3	ACHIEVE A 60% CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DIVERSION RATE BY 2025.	Based on Colorado Association for Recycling statewide diversion target and the U.S. EPA national target for the construction and demolition industry.	Hauler reports and/or waste characterization study
	ACHIEVE A 60-90% DIVERSION RATE FOR PRIORITY WASTE STREAMS <i>(priority waste streams will be established through implementation Strategy ZW3-A).</i>	To be established as part of implementation strategy.	To be established as part of implementation strategy

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Colorado Association for Recycling – 66% diversion of total solid waste in Colorado by 2021 (2009 baseline – 36%)</li> <li>■ Star Communities – Achieve 100% reduction in communitywide solid waste that is disposed of via landfill or incinerator by 2050</li> </ul>	Philadelphia – Divert 70% of solid waste from landfill by 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – Reduce waste by 25% by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Colorado Springs – 70% diversion by 2030</li> <li>■ Denver – Reduce waste disposed of by delivery to a landfill by 20% by 2020 (2012 baseline)</li> <li>■ Boulder – 85% waste diversion by 2017</li> <li>■ Tacoma – 70% solid waste diversion by 2028</li> </ul>
-	-	-	-
-	-	Orlando – 60% recycling rate at all city facilities	Ft. Collins – Reduce waste from publicly accessible facilities by 5% per year; municipal workplaces and offices by 10% per year; and industrial operations by 10% per year based on data reported for previous year
-	-	-	-
-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Colorado Association for Recycling – 66% diversion of total solid waste in Colorado by 2021 (2009 baseline – 36%)</li> <li>■ Star Communities – Achieve 100% reduction in communitywide solid waste that is disposed of via landfill or incinerator by 2050</li> </ul>	Philadelphia – Divert 70% of solid waste from landfill by 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Golden – Reduce waste by 25% by 2017 (2007 baseline)</li> <li>■ Denver – Reduce waste disposed of by delivery to a landfill by 20% by 2020 (2012 baseline)</li> <li>■ Tacoma – 70% solid waste diversion by 2028</li> </ul>
-	U.S. EPA – 75% diversion of construction and demolition waste in the U.S. by 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Seattle – 70% construction and demolition waste diversion by 2020</li> <li>■ San Diego – Requires the majority of construction and demolition projects to divert at least 50% of waste</li> </ul>	-
-	-	-	-

	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: CC1	INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE OF RESIDENTS REPORTING "GOOD" OR "VERY GOOD" SATISFACTION RATINGS FOR LAKEWOOD'S EFFORTS AT WELCOMING CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT AS REPORTED IN THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD CITIZEN SURVEY TO 60% BY 2025.	Identified as measurable indicator of civic engagement in conjunction with City Manager's Office.	City of Lakewood Citizen Survey
	INCREASE RESIDENT SUBSCRIPTIONS TO CITY COMMUNICATION TOOLS EACH YEAR THROUGH 2025.	Identified as measurable indicator of civic engagement in conjunction with City Manager's Office.	City of Lakewood Communications Division
	CERTIFY 12 NEIGHBORHOODS AS "OUTSTANDING SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBORHOODS" IN THE SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM BY 2025.	Based on existing interest and growth potential of the program.	City of Lakewood Sustainability Division
GOAL: CC2	INCREASE RECREATION PROGRAM PARTICIPATION EACH YEAR THROUGH 2025.	Identified as measurable indicator of public health in conjunction with the Community Resources Department.	City of Lakewood Community Resources Department
	ELIMINATE USDA-DEFINED FOOD DESERTS IN LAKEWOOD.	Based on a combination of opportunities for additional food outlets and momentum of local food movement.	U.S. Department of Agriculture Food Access Research Atlas
GOAL: CC3	ACHIEVE COMMUNITY AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGETS ( <i>to be established after the completion of Implementation Strategy CC3-A</i> ).	To be established as part of implementation strategy.	To be established as part of implementation strategy
	INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE OF RESIDENTS REPORTING "GOOD" OR "VERY GOOD" SATISFACTION RATINGS FOR LAKEWOOD PROGRAMS FOR PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS, OLDER ADULTS, LOW-INCOME PERSONS, AND HOMELESS PEOPLE TO ABOVE FRONT RANGE BENCHMARKS.	Identified as measurable indicator of civic satisfaction in conjunction with City Manager's Office.	City of Lakewood Citizen Survey

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
-	Star Communities – Increase percentage of residents who believe they are able to have a positive impact on their community	-	-
-	-	-	-
-	-	-	Denver – Additional two neighborhoods every six months supported by two full time employees
-	-	-	-
-	Star Communities – Decrease over the past three years in the percentage of residents living in an urban or rural food desert	-	-
-	Star Communities – Achieve targets for creation of new affordable housing identified in local housing strategy	-	-
-	-	-	-

	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: NS1	<p><b>INCREASE THE ACREAGE OF FUNCTIONAL AND HEALTHY NATURAL ECOSYSTEMS.</b>  <i>(Specific target to be established after the completion of Implementation Strategy NS1-C).</i></p>	To be established as part of implementation strategy.	To be established as part of implementation strategy
	<p><b>ENSURE THAT ALL WATERS WITHIN LAKEWOOD MEET OR EXCEED THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT’S WATER QUALITY STANDARDS FOR THE USES ASSIGNED.</b></p>	Based on the Clean Water Act requirements and recommendations from city staff.	U.S. EPA and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE)
GOAL: NS2	<p><b>ACHIEVE 30% TREE CANOPY COVERAGE BY 2025.</b></p>	Based on recommendations from the 2013 Metro Denver Urban Forest Assessment and work group recommendations.	To be established as part of implementation strategy

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
-	Star Communities – Achieve targets for acres of land conserved in priority natural system areas identified in a locally adopted natural systems or land conservation plan	-	-
-	Star Communities – All nonindustrial water bodies are swimmable and fishable during 90% of days in the past year	Baltimore – Ensure that Baltimore water bodies are fishable and swimmable	Denver – Make all Denver rivers and creeks swimmable and fishable
-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ 2013 Metro Denver Urban Forest Assessment estimated a 20% existing tree canopy coverage for Lakewood and recommended a 34% target to fill 50% of potential planting sites.</li> <li>■ Star Communities – 35% of land area has protected vegetated surface performing a minimum of two of the following: cooling, water management, recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Philadelphia – Increase tree coverage toward 30% in all neighborhoods by 2025</li> <li>■ Orlando – 95% of potential street tree spaces contain living trees by 2030</li> </ul>	Ft. Collins – Maintain a 30% forest canopy density in suitable areas of City Parks and 70% of native vegetative cover in Natural Areas

	TARGET	JUSTIFICATION	DATA SOURCES
GOAL: T1	<p><b>CONVERT ALL STREETLIGHTS TO LED OR OTHER HIGH-EFFICIENCY LIGHTING TECHNOLOGIES BY 2025.</b></p>	<p>Significant energy and financial savings with quick payback period. This target requires cooperation from Xcel.</p>	<p>City of Lakewood Traffic Engineering and Xcel</p>
GOAL: T2	<p><b>REDUCE LAKEWOOD'S DAILY PER CAPITA VEHICLE-MILES-TRAVELED BY 10% BY 2025 (Baseline: 2007).</b></p>	<p>Based on DRCOG Metro Vision 2035 target.</p>	<p>Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)</p>
	<p><b>REDUCE THE PERCENT OF TRIPS TO WORK BY SINGLE-OCCUPANCY VEHICLES FROM 75% TO 65% BY 2025 (Baseline: 2007).</b></p>	<p>Based on DRCOG Metro Vision 2035 target.</p>	<p>Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)</p>
	<p><b>DECREASE PETROLEUM-BASED FUEL CONSUMPTION OF THE CITY FLEET BY 10% BY 2025 (Baseline: 2014).</b></p>	<p>Based on a combination of increased fuel-efficiency standard and evolving alternative fuel vehicle market.</p>	<p>City of Lakewood Fleet Division</p>

CALCULATION TOOLS/METHODS	INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION & SCIENTIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS	NATIONAL EXAMPLES	COLORADO & SIMILAR EXAMPLES
-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Los Angeles – Convert 147,700 streetlights converted, 61% energy savings, \$7.7 million energy cost savings, 7 year payback</li> <li>■ Seattle – 41,000 streetlights, 15 million kWh energy savings, \$2.6 million annual energy cost savings, 7.6 year payback</li> </ul>	-
DRCOG travel modelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The DRCOG Metro Vision 2035 aims to reduce daily vehicle-miles-traveled per capita in the Denver metro area by 10%.</li> <li>■ Star Communities – Annual decrease in VMT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Philadelphia – Reduce VMT by 10% by 2015 (2008 baseline)</li> <li>■ Seattle – 20% VMT reduction by 2030</li> </ul>	Golden – Reduce communitywide VMT by 15% by 2017 (2007 baseline)
DRCOG travel modelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The DRCOG Metro Vision 2035 aims to lower single-occupancy vehicle trips to work in the Denver metro area from 74% to 65%.</li> <li>■ Star Communities – 60% maximum for drive alone for journey-to-work trips</li> </ul>	Vancouver – Make the majority (over 50%) of trips by foot, bicycle, and public transit.	Denver – Provide mobility options that reduce personal travel in Denver done in single-occupant vehicles to no more than 60% of all trips.
-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Philadelphia – Reduce fuel consumption of the city fleet by 15% by 2015 (2006 baseline)</li> <li>■ Columbus – Reduce fuel consumption of the City fleet by 2% by 2014 (2010 baseline)</li> <li>■ San Jose – 100% alternative fuel vehicles by 2022</li> <li>■ Seattle – 42% reduction in petroleum-based fuel use by 2020</li> <li>■ Austin - Carbon Neutral Fleet by 2020</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Littleton - Reduce city vehicle fuel consumption by 10% by 2010 (2008 baseline)</li> <li>■ Ft. Collins - Reduce the traditional fuel use of the city's fleet by 20% by 2020</li> <li>■ Flagstaff - Phase out 100% of inefficient and underutilized vehicles from fleet (long-term goal)</li> </ul>

**MORE**

---

**LEARN MORE ABOUT LAKEWOOD'S SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS**

**[WWW.LAKEWOOD.ORG/SUSTAINABILITY](http://WWW.LAKEWOOD.ORG/SUSTAINABILITY)**



