**Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Development Tool**

|  | **Alameda CTC Complete Streets Policy Element Requirement (adopted by Alameda CTC 10/25/12)** | **Draft relevant element language from Sample Resolution** | **Direct links to National Complete Streets Coalition (NCSC) resources** | **Relevant policy element examples (as listed in NCSC “Policy Analysis 2011”)**  **[Community/Year Adopted/Link to Policy]** | **Draft your local policy resolution language here:** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Vision:** A clear and strong vision that is based on local needs and goals. The vision must include that all transportation improvements will be planned, funded, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. | [Insert VISION statement here.] | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 16](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=16)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 16](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=16) | Des Plaines, IL / 2011  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-desplaines-policy.pdf>  Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area) / 2010  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-in-mccog-policy.pdf>  Big Lake, MN / 2010  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-biglake-policy.pdf>  Bozeman, MT / 2010  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mt-bozeman-resolution.pdf>  Dayton, OH / 2010  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/> |  |
| **2** | **All Users and Modes:** All users (referenced above) will include pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, seniors, children, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, and emergency responders. | **Complete Streets Serving All Users and Modes.** [Jurisdiction] expresses its commitment to creating and maintaining Complete Streets that provide safe, comfortable, and convenient travel along and across streets (including streets, roads, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system) through a comprehensive, integrated transportation network that serves all categories of users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, emergency responders, seniors, children, youth, and families *[insert other significant local users if desired, e.g. drivers of agricultural vehicles, freight, etc.].* | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 20](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=20)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 18](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=18) | Azusa, CA / 2011  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-azusa-policy.pdf>  Blue Island, IL / 2011  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-blueisland-ordinance.pdf>  Hennepin County, MN / 2009  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-hennepincounty-policy.pdf>  Crystal City, MO / 2010  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mo-crystalcity-ordinance.pdf>  Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area) / 2010  <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-oh-morpc-policy.pdf> |  |
| **3** | **All Projects/Phases:** The policy applies to all roadway projects including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, or expansion of existing roadways, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use. | **All Projects and Phases.** Complete Streets infrastructure sufficient to enable reasonably safe travel along and across the right of way for each category of users will be incorporated into all planning, funding, design, approval, and implementation processes for any construction, reconstruction, retrofit, maintenance, operations, alteration, or repair of streets (including streets, roads, highways, bridges, and other portions of the transportation system), except that specific infrastructure for a given category of users may be excluded if an exception is approved via the process set forth in section C.1 of this policy. | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 22](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=22)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 19](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=19) | Birmingham, AL / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-al-birmingham-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-al-birmingham-resolution.pdf)  California Department of Transportation / 2008  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-ca-dotpolicy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-ca-dotpolicy.pdf)  Cook County, IL / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-il-cookcounty-ordinance.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-il-cookcounty-ordinance.pdf)  Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development / 2010  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-la-dotpolicy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-la-dotpolicy.pdf)  Babylon, NY / 2010  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-ny-babylon-policy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-ny-babylon-policy.pdf) |  |
| **4** | **Exceptions:** Jurisdictions must prepare a process for approving exceptions, including who is allowed to sign off on exceptions. Written findings for exceptions must be included in a memorandum, signed off by a high level staff person, such as the Public Works director, or senior-level designee, and made publicly available. Exceptions must explain why accommodations for all users and modes were not included in the plan or project. | **Exception Approvals.** A process will be developed for approving exceptions, including who is allowed to sign off on exceptions. Written findings for exceptions must be included in a memorandum, signed off by a high level staff person, such as the Public Works Director, or senior-level designee, and made publicly available. Exceptions must explain why accommodations for all users and modes were not included in the plan or project. *[Specific exceptions can be listed here.]* | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 24](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=24)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 19](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=19)  Federal guidance on exceptions: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm>). | Berwyn, IL / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-il-berwyn-ordinance.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-il-berwyn-ordinance.pdf)  Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area) / 2009  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-in-bmcmpo-policy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-in-bmcmpo-policy.pdf)  New Orleans, LA / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-la-neworleans-ordinance.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-la-neworleans-ordinance.pdf)  Missoula, MT / 2009  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-mt-missoula-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-mt-missoula-resolution.pdf)  Bellevue, NE / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-ne-bellevue-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-ne-bellevue-resolution.pdf) |  |
| **5** | **Network/Connectivity:** The transportation system should provide a comprehensive, integrated and connected network of facilities for all modes of travel. A well-connected network should include non-motorized connectivity to schools, transit, parks, commercial areas, and civic destinations. | **Network/Connectivity.** [Jurisdiction] will incorporate Complete Streets infrastructure into existing streets to improve the safety and convenience of all users, with the particular goal of creating a connected network of facilities accommodating each category of users, and increasing connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries and for anticipated future transportation investments. | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 30](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=30)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 21](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=21) | None listed, see NCSC documents. |  |
| **6** | **Jurisdiction:** All departments in the jurisdiction whose work affects the roadway must incorporate a complete streets approach into the review and implementation of their projects and activities. As well, the jurisdiction will work in coordination with other agencies, transit districts and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation in designing and building transportation projects. | **Complete Streets Routinely Addressed by All Departments.** All relevant departments and agencies of [Jurisdiction] will work towards making Complete Streets practices a routine part of everyday operations, approach every relevant project, program, and practice as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all categories of users, and work in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation. | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 32](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=32)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 21](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=21) | None listed, see NCSC documents. |  |
| **7** | **Design:** The jurisdiction will define and generally follow its own accepted or adopted design standards, and will also evaluate using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs. | **Design.** [Jurisdiction] will generally follow its own accepted or adopted design standards, including *[list names here]*, and will also evaluate using the latest design standards and innovative design options, with a goal of balancing user needs. | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 34](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=34)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 22](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=22) | None listed, see NCSC documents. |  |
| **8** | **Context Sensitivity:** The planning and implementation of transportation projects will reflect conditions within and surrounding the project area, whether the area is a residential or business district or urban, suburban or rural. Project planning, design and construction of complete streets projects should include working with residents, merchants and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place is maintained. | **Context Sensitivity.** In planning and implementing street projects, departments and agencies of [Jurisdiction] will maintain sensitivity to local conditions in both residential and business districts as well as urban, suburban, and rural areas, and will work with residents, merchants, and other stakeholders to ensure that a strong sense of place ensues. Improvements that will be considered include sidewalks, shared use paths, bicycle lanes, bicycle routes, paved shoulders, street trees and landscaping, planting strips, accessible curb ramps, crosswalks, refuge islands, pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, bicycle parking facilities, public transportation stops and facilities, transit priority signalization, and other features assisting in the provision of safe travel for all users, such *[ insert other accommodations if desired] [,* and those features identified in *insert name of Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan if it exists].* | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 36](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=36)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 22](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=22) | None listed, see NCSC document. |  |
| **9** | **Performance Measures:** Jurisdiction will establish performance measures, and identify a means to collect data for the measures, to evaluate the implementation of the complete streets policy. Examples include tracking the number of miles of bicycle lanes and sidewalks, numbers of street crossings, transit ridership, etc. Specific measures should be listed. | **Performance Measures.** All relevant agencies or departments will perform evaluations of how well the streets and transportation network of [Jurisdiction] are serving each category of users by collecting baseline data and collecting follow-up data on a regular basis. | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 38](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=38)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 22](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=22) | Winter Park, FL / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-fl-winterpark-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-fl-winterpark-resolution.pdf)  Baltimore, MD / 2010  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-md-baltimore-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-md-baltimore-resolution.pdf)  New Hope, MN / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-mn-newhope-policy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-mn-newhope-policy.pdf)  Roanoke, VA / 2008  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-va-roanoke-policy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-va-roanoke-policy.pdf)  La Crosse, WI / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-wi-lacrosse-ordinance.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-wi-lacrosse-ordinance.pdf) |  |
| **10** | **Implementation Next Steps:** Jurisdiction will include a list of [specific next steps](http://www.completestreets.org/changing-policy/policy-elements/) for implementation of the Complete Streets policy. Implementation actions will include that any proposed improvements will be evaluated for consistency with all local plans, including bicycle, pedestrian and/or transit plans, and any other plans that affect the right-of- way. Implementation actions will also include that publicinput on projects and plans will be solicited from stakeholders, including local bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees (BPACs) and other advisory groups, as appropriate, as early in the development process as possible. | **Implementation Next Steps**. [Jurisdiction] will take the following specific next steps to implement this Complete Streets Policy:  A. Plan Consultation and Consistency: Maintenance, planning, and design of projects affecting the transportation system will be consistent with local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, and other relevant plans.  B. Stakeholder Consultation: Develop and/or clearly define a process to allow for stakeholder involvement on projects and plans including, but not limited to, local bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees (BPACs) and/or other advisory groups, as defined necessary to support implementation of this Complete Streets policy by [insert jurisdiction].  C. *[Add additional specific next steps here.]* | [Local Policy Workbook – Page 43](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyworkbook.pdf#page=43)  [Policy Analysis 2011 – Page 24](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-policyanalysis.pdf#page=24) | Baldwin Park, CA / 2011  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-ca-baldwinpark-policy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-ca-baldwinpark-policy.pdf)  Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco, CA area) / 2006  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-ca-mtc-policy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-ca-mtc-policy.pdf)  Lee County, FL / 2009  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-fl-leecounty-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-fl-leecounty-resolution.pdf)  Helena, MT / 2010  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-mt-helena-resolution.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-mt-helena-resolution.pdf)  New Jersey Department of Transportation / 2009  [http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/ cs-nj-dotpolicy.pdf](http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/%20cs-nj-dotpolicy.pdf) |  |