

COMPLETE STREETS

policy analysis 2011

Inclusive. Diverse. Accountable.



Smart Growth America
Making Neighborhoods Great Together



**National Complete
Streets Coalition**

www.smartgrowthamerica.org

This report was written by Stefanie Seskin, with assistance from Barbara McCann. Eryn Rosenblum and Catherine Vanderwaart were essential in providing their assistance with the analysis.

August 2012



Complete Streets Policy Analysis 2011 is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License, permitting non-commercial use with attribution. Any of these conditions may be waived with permission.
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	8
Table: Points and Weights per Policy Element	15
Vision	16
<i>Intent</i>	16
Core Commitment	18
<i>All Users and Modes</i>	18
<i>Projects and Phases</i>	19
<i>Exceptions</i>	19
Best Practice Elements	21
<i>Network</i>	21
<i>Jurisdiction</i>	21
<i>Design</i>	22
<i>Context Sensitivity</i>	22
<i>Performance Measures</i>	22
Implementation Next Steps	24
Highlights: Top Policies	26
Methodology	29
Appendix: Policy Analysis	

Executive Summary

Hundreds of communities of all sizes, in all parts of the country, see their streets as something more than just a way to move people in cars from point A to point B. More than 350 have adopted Complete Streets policies – with 146 of those policies adopted in 2011 alone. These communities have joined a growing national movement for Complete Streets, a movement that encourages and provides for safe access to destinations for everyone, regardless of age, ability, income, ethnicity, or mode of travel.


A Complete Streets approach redefines what a street is intended to do, what goals a transportation agency is going to meet, and how the community will spend its transportation money. It breaks down the traditional separation of ‘highways,’ ‘transit,’ and ‘biking/walking,’ and instead focuses on the desired outcome of a transportation system that supports safe and universally inclusive roadway use.

This report documents the growth of that diverse movement and its strengths by analyzing the more than 350 existing written policies adopted by states, regions, counties, and communities before January 1, 2012. Policies that come closest to meeting the ‘ideal’ are highlighted. Used in conjunction with the *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook*, this report is also a useful tool for communities looking to develop their own Complete Streets policy based on current best practices. Many examples in this report come from policies adopted in 2011, in part because so many strong examples were adopted last year.

Nation Embraces Complete Streets


Complete Streets policy adoption continues to accelerate rapidly: 146 communities adopted policies in 2011, compared to the 80 new policies we analyzed at the end of 2010. By the start of 2012, more than 350 policies were in place at all levels of government, directing the transformation of community transportation networks into Complete Streets. Over half of state governments or Departments of Transportation (26) had some form of Complete Streets policy, and more than 20 percent of cities with over 100,000 residents

Policy Adoption Over Time




had also committed to this approach. Policy adoption is remarkably widespread: just two states are without a Complete Streets policy at any level of government, while ten states have more than 15 policies on the books.

Policy Adoption Across the Country



Communities Adopting Policies



The movement is not limited to states or large cities; communities of all sizes find these policies valuable. Over one-third of all policies were adopted in suburban communities of fewer than 30,000 residents. Small towns, often in rural areas, are well represented: nearly one in five of all Complete Streets policies were adopted in these jurisdictions.

Insights

Inclusive.

The National Complete Streets Coalition promotes a holistic approach to transportation decision-making – one that recognizes the complex environment of users and modes – as the best way to ensure community streets are safer for all. Through this analysis, it's clear that Complete Streets policies are becoming more and more inclusive. Through 2011, 86 percent of policies address at least people walking, bicycling, and taking transit, and a full 75 percent go beyond those modes to include motorists, commercial traffic, emergency responders, or more. Further, the fact that people are indeed different – some older, some younger, some with disabilities – is reflected in adopted Complete Streets policies. Almost 70 percent include references to people of all ages and 85 percent acknowledge those with disabilities. These numbers have grown over the past few years as well: in 2008, only 38.5 percent of policies acknowledged people of all ages and just two-thirds addressed the needs of people with disabilities.

Diverse.

While a big-city or coastal perception of the Complete Streets movement still persists, our analysis shows that the movement is based in smaller communities in metropolitan areas in the Midwest. As noted above, over one-third of all policies are adopted in suburban communities of fewer than 30,000 people and nearly one-fifth of the policies are from communities in rural areas. At the other extreme, five of the ten largest U.S. cities already have a policy in place, and several more are working toward that goal in 2012. Only two states – South Dakota and Alaska – do not have some form of Complete Streets policy at any governmental level. Ten states have more than 15 policies on the books. Leading the policy adoption charge are the states of Michigan, Minnesota, and New Jersey, with 63, 29, and 28 policies on the books, respectively.

Accountable.

As with any policy initiative, Complete Streets policies can languish on the shelf, forgotten or ignored. However, a growing number of adopted policies – and especially ordinances – contain measures to ensure that written vision is translated into everyday practice. Over half of all adopted Complete Streets policies discuss implementation in some way – up from just over one-third three years ago. Over 60 percent of ordinances and over two-thirds of policies adopted by elected boards directly address next steps. Seventeen communities have taken the advanced step to include measurable performance goals for their projects and community streets. More than 50 require the creation of an implementation advisory board or a report on implementation activities.

Top Policies

The National Complete Streets Coalition has enumerated ten elements that are part of an ‘ideal’ Complete Streets policy. Though the concept of “Complete Streets” is itself simple and inspiring, the Coalition has found, through research and practice, that a policy document must do more than simply affirm support for Complete Streets. The ten elements refine the vision, provide clear direction and intent, and grant the flexibility in design and approach necessary to secure an effective Complete Streets process and outcome.

In this report, we compare each adopted policy to our ten elements. Those policies that achieve top scores for particular elements are highlighted within the text. Policies that received the top overall scores can be found on page 26. The appendix contains the scores for all adopted policies, grouped by type of policy document and level of governance.

The top-scoring policies from all levels, and of all policy types, are noted below. Refer to the additional lists in the report for more high-scoring policies.

New Jersey Department of Transportation	<i>Policy No. 703</i>
Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
California Department of Transportation	<i>Deputy Directive 64-R1</i>
State of Minnesota	<i>Sec. 52. Minnesota Statutes 2008, section 174.75</i>
State of Connecticut	<i>Public Act 09-154 (SB 735)</i>
Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission	<i>Regional Complete Streets Policy</i>
Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Org.	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Hennepin County, Minnesota	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Cook County, Illinois	<i>Ordinance</i>
Wilkin County, Minnesota	<i>Resolution</i>
Baldwin Park, California	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
New Hope, Minnesota	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Crystal City, Missouri	<i>Ordinance</i>
Birmingham, Alabama	<i>Resolution</i>
Bellevue, Nebraska	<i>Resolution</i>
Azusa, California	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Roanoke, Virginia	<i>Complete Streets Policy</i>
Big Lake, Minnesota	<i>Resolution No. 2010-74</i>
Blue Island, Illinois	<i>Ordinance</i>

Introduction

Hundreds of communities of all sizes, in all parts of the country, see their streets as something more than just a way to move people in cars from point A to point B. More than 350 have adopted Complete Streets policies – with 146 of those policies adopted in 2011 alone. These communities have joined a growing national movement for Complete Streets, a movement that encourages and provides for the safe access to destinations for everyone, regardless of age, ability, income, ethnicity, or mode of travel.

The power of the Complete Streets movement is that it fundamentally redefines what a street is intended to do, what goals a transportation agency is going to meet, and how the community will spend its transportation money. It breaks down the traditional separation of ‘highways,’ ‘transit,’ and ‘biking/walking,’ and instead focuses on the desired outcome of a transportation system that supports safe use of the roadway for everyone, by whatever means they are traveling.

Complete Streets policies change the traditional transportation paradigm from “moving cars quickly” to “providing safe access for all modes.” Three hundred and fifty-nine policies have been adopted across the country including: 26 states, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia; 33 regional planning organizations; 31 counties; and 268 municipalities of all sizes.

The National Complete Streets Coalition supports communities as they develop, adopt, and implement Complete Streets policies. As part of this work, we promote a comprehensive policy model that includes ten ideal elements. Though the concept of “Complete Streets” is itself simple and inspiring, the Coalition has found, through research and practice, that a policy must do more than simply affirm support for Complete Streets. The ten elements refine the vision, provide clear direction and intent, are accountable to a community’s needs, and grant the flexibility in design and approach necessary to secure an effective Complete Streets process and outcome.

About This Document

As communities continue to take an interest in Complete Streets policies, we’ve found an increasing need to provide clear, nuanced descriptions of what ‘ideal’ policies look like; to help communities develop language that best fits their needs; and to recognize the communities that have crafted language that will make a real difference in their neighborhoods. To accomplish this,

we've developed two tools: a *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook* for counties and cities to more fully examine their current practices and Complete Streets needs; and this annual *Policy Analysis* report to document how well best practices are represented in adopted policy language.

Our methodology, described in the pages that follow, is based on the ten elements of an ideal Complete Streets policy developed in consultation with members of the National Complete Streets Coalition Steering Committee and our Workshop Instructor corps, as well as through what we learned in researching the American Planning Association report, *Complete Streets: Best Policy and Implementation Practices*. These elements come from decades of experience in transportation planning and design, reflecting a national model of best practice that can be employed in nearly all types of Complete Streets policy.

This analysis is based on what has been written on paper and is not intended to reflect the degree to which any given community is successful in implementing its Complete Streets goals. Creating change within a transportation agency's procedures and processes, and translating those changes into on-the-ground work, will be investigated through other tools the Coalition is developing.

What Is a Complete Streets Policy?

Complete Streets policies formalize a community's intent to plan, design, operate, and maintain streets so they are safe for all users of all ages and abilities. Policies direct decision-makers to consistently fund, plan for, design, and construct community streets to accommodate all anticipated users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, and freight vehicles.

The National Complete Streets Coalition recognizes many different types of policy statements as official commitments to a Complete Streets approach, including: legislation, resolutions, executive orders, departmental policies, policies adopted by an elected board, plans, and design guidance. Refer to the *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook* for an explanation of these different types of policies, and for guidance on employing them.


While we recognize and count Complete Streets policies included as part of formal planning documents and design guidance, we do not provide a numerical analysis in this document. We have found that our methodology is not as well adapted to the nuances of and detail provided in community transportation master plans, comprehensive plans, general plans, and design guidance.

Nation Embraces Complete Streets


Complete Streets policy adoption has been accelerating rapidly, with the number of policies adopted roughly doubling each of the last three years. This report includes analysis of all adopted policies, but draws more heavily on 2011 policies for examples.

Over half the states (26) have some form of Complete Streets policy, from legislation to policies adopted by state Departments of Transportation; they are joined by legislation in Puerto Rico and a departmental policy in Washington, D.C. Regional planning organizations are also joining in, with more than 30 funding and supporting networks of Complete Streets in their areas. More than 30 counties are also directing their transportation staff to consider the needs of all users.

Policy Adoption Over Time



Communities Adopting Policies





Most policies, though, are adopted at the local level; advanced by residents, public health advocates, and transportation professionals; and championed by local elected officials. Cities and towns, large and small, are looking to Complete Streets as a way to manage growing demand for active transportation options and to support economic vitality. Of the 268 municipalities with a Complete Streets policy, over one-third are suburban communities of fewer than 30,000 people. Small towns, often in rural areas, are well represented, with about one-fifth of policies adopted by these smaller jurisdictions.

On the other end of the spectrum, twenty percent of cities with at least 100,000 residents have committed to Complete Streets.

Policy adoption is remarkably widespread: just two states do not have a Complete Streets policy at any level of government, while ten states have over 15 policies on the books. Leading the policy adoption charge are the states of Michigan, Minnesota, and New Jersey, with 63, 29, and 28 policies, respectively.

Policy Adoption Across the Country



Just over 18 percent of Complete Streets policies are passed as legislation and encoded in statutes, while nearly half are expressed through non-binding resolutions. Internal policies, adopted by top-level departmental leaders, made up about 8.5 percent of all policies, and just under 10 percent are contained inside planning documents such as comprehensive plans. Growing in number are city policies that are approved by the legislative branch; such policies, which are generally more detailed, make up nearly 11 percent of all Complete Streets policies.

The Complete Streets movement has been powered by diverse alliances that have brought together advocates for older Americans, public health agencies, transportation practitioners, bicycle advocates, and many others. Policies have been adopted as part of public health campaigns to create friendly environments for healthy physical activity; as a way to address pressing safety concerns; and as one answer to the need to create more sustainable communities, both environmentally and economically.

Analyzing Policy Language

The National Complete Streets Coalition promotes a comprehensive policy model that includes ten ideal elements. Though the concept of “Complete Streets” is itself simple and inspiring, the Coalition has found, through research and practice, that a policy must do more than simply affirm support for Complete Streets. The ten ideal elements refine the vision, provide clear direction and intent, are accountable to a community’s needs, and grant the flexibility in design and approach necessary to secure an effective Complete Streets process and outcome.

The ten elements can be divided into four categories:

- ‘Pre-policy’ work of establishing a compelling vision;
- Creating a strong core commitment to providing for all users and modes in all projects;
- Rounding out that directive with supporting best practices; and
- Planning next steps for policy implementation.

This report focuses on how written policy language adopted to date compares to the Coalition’s ten elements of an ideal policy. Refer to the *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook* for a detailed discussion of each of the ten elements and questions for your community to answer in coming up with the most appropriate language for your own policy document.

Each written policy adopted before January 1, 2012 was compared against the ten elements and awarded up to 5 points for how well it fulfilled each of the elements (see table on page 15). This score was weighted to emphasize the policy elements proven through research and Coalition member experience to be of more importance in a written policy. Upon further investigation into how policy elements influence implementation, we plan to revisit how each element is weighted; however, this year we made no changes in weighting from our 2010 report.

Just as community streets vary in form and facilities, we do recognize that there are inherent differences between policy types. What can be accomplished through a legislative act will be different than what might be included in a comprehensive plan, for example. We acknowledge that some elements of an ideal policy are unlikely to appear in some policy types and encourage comparison within policy type, rather than across all types. For this reason, policies are grouped by policy type.

In undergoing this scored analysis, we have found it does not work as well for comprehensive plans, where a finer analysis is needed to accurately determine strength and reach of the Complete Streets element within the overall framework of the large and more complex plan.

The tool is also inappropriate for simple design standards that include little information about

the justification and goals of those designs for the community and for more detailed design manuals. We do not use this tool on either of these policy types; however, we do include these policies in our count and you can find them listed on our website: www.completestreets.org/atlas. Though some design manuals may have a more extensive discussion of policy, their place within the transportation process makes the inclusion of some elements of an ideal Complete Streets policy inappropriate. Thus, it is rare for these policies to have much additional guidance in implementation of the community's Complete Streets vision. It is important to note that design guidance is rarely the first Complete Streets policy adopted in a community and is often the realization of some earlier policy effort and part of the implementation process.

Using the Report

The main report includes listings of the strongest policies overall, as well as those that show particular strength in a single element. These lists were determined using the numerical scores and weights shown on page 15. Within the report you'll find quotes from actual policies and links so you can read more high-scoring policies. We provide reference links for intent; the 'core elements' of a Complete Streets policy; and elements related to implementation. The lists cover all adopted policies, but the examples listed in the text draw more heavily on the most recent 2011 policies. The appendix lists all policies analyzed, grouped by policy type and listed in order of their strength.

Used with the *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook*, this report can help inspire policy language based on well-written, existing documents in communities like your own. We encourage readers to go beyond the limited number of policies named in the main report and use the appendix to look for good policies in your own region or policies that fit particular criteria.

In communities where a Complete Streets policy is already in place, this report can be used to compare your policy language to the 'ideal', possibly inspiring improvements to the current policy or giving your community a reason to boast. It can also help in thinking through the various pieces of effective implementation. In addition to the steps discussed in the "Implementation Next Steps" section, you may find inspiration in thinking through how to reach the 'ideal' of each element through your everyday transportation decision making. For example, are all users' needs considered in traffic signal operations? How is your community improving network connectivity for all modes?

Measuring Complete Streets Implementation

This report focuses exclusively on the strength of the language used in Complete Streets policies. Adoption of a policy with strong language is only the first step: the policies must lead to changes inside of transportation agencies that then lead to project-level changes as transportation projects are designed for the safe use of bicyclists, transit users, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities. Scores from this policy analysis do not directly translate to a community's success in achieving agency and on-the-ground change.

We know from our research and experience that full implementation requires agencies to offer additional educational opportunities for staff and community leaders, as well as to create new project development processes; review and revise design standards; and adopt new performance measures. Policies that look good on paper are of little value if they do not lead to change in practice and in projects on the ground. We are encouraged that more policies are including specific implementation steps, such as forming a committee, directing updates to specific documents, or instituting reporting requirements and deadlines.

We hope the guidance provided here and in the *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook* helps those charged with policy-writing set appropriate and achievable goals for implementation activities. Keep an eye out for upcoming implementation resources from the National Complete Streets Coalition, including more specific steps that communities have and can take to ensure their policy vision translates into on-the-ground change.

Points per Policy Element and Weighted Points

Element	Details	Points	Weight
Intent		max: 5	6
	Indirect – indirect statement (“shall implement Complete Streets principles”)	1	
OR	Average – direct statement with equivocating or weaker language (“consider”, “may”)	3	
OR	Direct – direct statement of accommodation (“shall”, “must”, “will”)	5	
Core Commitment			
All Users and Modes		max: 5	20
	Pedestrians and bicyclists (required for consideration)	--	
OR	Pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit	1	
OR	Pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, plus one more mode	2	
OR	Pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, plus two more modes	3	
	Plus a point for including a reference to users of all ages	1	
	Plus a point for including a reference to users of all abilities	1	
Projects and Phases		max: 5	12
	New construction only	0	
OR	New and retrofit/reconstruction projects	3	
	Plus points if policy clearly applies to all projects, or specifically includes repair/3R projects, maintenance, and/or operations	2	
Exceptions		max: 5	16
	No mention	0	
OR	Lists exceptions, but at least one lacks clarity or allows for loose interpretation	1	
OR	Lists exceptions clearly and without much room for loopholes	2	
	Plus points for specifying an approval process	3	
Best Practice Elements			
Network		max: 5	2
	No mention	0	
OR	Acknowledges	5	
Jurisdiction		max: 5	8
	Agency-owned roads (assumed)	0	
OR	States and regions: agency-funded projects but not on agency-owned roads	3	
OR	Counties and cities: privately built roads	3	
	Plus points for recognizing need to work with other agencies, departments, or jurisdictions	2	
Design		max: 5	4
	No mention	0	
	Points for referencing specific design criteria or directing use of the best and latest	3	
	Points for referencing design flexibility in balancing user needs	2	
Context Sensitivity		max: 5	8
	No mention	0	
OR	Acknowledges	5	
Performance Measures		max: 5	4
	No mention	0	
OR	Establishes new measures (does not count toward implementation points)	5	
Implementation Next Steps		max: 5	20
	No implementation plans specified	0	
OR	Addresses implementation in general	1	
OR	Addresses at least two of our implementation steps	3	
	Plus a point for assigning oversight to a committee or person OR establishing a reporting requirement	1	
	Plus a point for directing changes to project selection criteria	1	

Vision

States and communities are adopting Complete Streets policies for many reasons. For example, in Baldwin Park, California, the community recognized that streets without safe and comfortable places for walking and bicycling were an impediment to their goal of improving public health. A strong vision can inspire a community to follow through on its complete streets policy. Just as no two policies are alike, visions are not one-size-fits-all either. Because each community has its own valid vision that cannot be empirically compared across policies, for this criterion we looked to the core of the Complete Streets commitment – one that brings all users into the everyday planning, design, construction, and operation of transportation systems.

“The Town of Babylon recognizes the absolute necessity of promoting pedestrian, bicycle and public transportation travel as an alternative to the automobile in order to protect all road users, reduce negative environmental impacts, promote healthy living, and advance the well-being of commuters.”

– Babylon, New York

Intent

Clarity of intent and writing makes it easy for those tasked with implementation to understand the new goals and determine what changes need to be made fulfill the policy’s intent.

The strongest policies are those that are clear in intent, saying facilities that meet the needs of

“The City of Bozeman will plan for, design, construct, operate, and maintain appropriate facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles and riders, children, the elderly, and people with disabilities in all new construction and retrofit or reconstruction projects subject to the exceptions contained herein.”

– Bozeman, Montana

people traveling on foot or bicycle “shall” or “must” be included in transportation projects. The ‘strong’ label is also applied to policies in which the absolute intent of the policy is obvious and direct, even if they don’t use the words “shall” or “must”. These policies receive the full five points.

Policies are noted as ‘average’ when they are clear in their intent -- defining what exactly a community expects from the policy -- but use equivocating language that weakens the directive. For example, the policy says that the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists “will be considered” or “may be included” as part of the process. ‘Average’ policies receive a total of three points.

Some policies are ‘indirect’. They refer to implementation of certain principles, features, or elements defined elsewhere; refer to general ‘Complete Streets’ application with no clear directive;

or instruct the development of a more thorough policy document. Examples of indirect language include phrases such as “consider the installation of ‘Complete Streets’ transportation elements” and “supports the adoption and implementation of ‘Complete Streets’ policies and practices to create a transportation network that accommodates all users.” Using this language can perpetuate the separation of modes and the perception that a road for cars is fundamentally different from the road for other users, that only some roads should be “complete streets,” and even that these roads require special, separately funded “amenities”. For these reasons, policies with an indirect approach receive a total of one point for this category.

Policy Examples: Strong Complete Streets Intent

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Des Plaines, IL	Complete Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-desplaines-policy.pdf
Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	Internal Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-in-mccog-policy.pdf
Big Lake, MN	Resolution No. 2010-74	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-biglake-policy.pdf
Bozeman, MT	Resolution No. 4244	Resolution	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mt-bozeman-resolution.pdf
Dayton, OH	Livable Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-oh-dayton-policy.pdf

Core Commitment

All Users and Modes

A Complete Streets policy must begin with an understanding that people who travel by foot or on bicycle are legitimate users of the transportation system and equally deserving of safe facilities to accommodate their travel. No policy is a Complete Streets policy without a clear statement affirming this fact, and it is therefore a requirement to include both modes – walking and bicycling – in the policy before it can be further analyzed.

Beyond those two modes, our methodology requires policies to include public transportation to receive any additional points. Including one more mode, such as cars, freight traffic, emergency response vehicles, or equestrians, earns a total of two points. Including two additional user groups earns the policy three points.

“...all users, including, but not limited to motorists, cyclists, pedestrians, transit and school bus riders, delivery and service personnel, freight haulers, and emergency responders. “All users” includes people of all ages and abilities.”

*– Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission
(Columbus, Ohio region)*

Beyond the type of user is a more nuanced understanding that not all people who move by a certain mode are the same. For a reference to the needs of people young and old, a policy receives one additional point. For including people with disabilities, another point is awarded.

Policy Examples: All Users and Modes

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Azusa, CA	Complete Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-azusa-policy.pdf
Blue Island, IL	Ordinance No. 11-131	Legislation	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-blueisland-ordinance.pdf
Hennepin County, MN	Complete Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-hennepincounty-policy.pdf
Crystal City, MO	Ordinance	Legislation	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mo-crystalcity-ordinance.pdf
Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area)	Complete Streets Policy	Internal Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-oh-morpc-policy.pdf

Projects and Phases

The ideal result of a Complete Streets policy is that all transportation improvements are viewed as opportunities to create safer, more accessible streets for all users. Policies that apply only to new construction and reconstruction projects receive two points; policies that also clearly include maintenance, operations, or other projects receive all five points. Policies that do not apply to projects beyond newly constructed roads, or ones that are not clear regarding their application, receive no points.

“The City of Birmingham shall, to the maximum extent practical, scope, plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain all City streets to provide a comprehensive and integrated network of facilities for people of all ages and abilities traveling by foot, bicycling, automobile, public transportation, and commercial vehicle.”

– Birmingham, Alabama

Policy Examples: Projects and Phases

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Birmingham, AL	Complete Streets Resolution	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-al-birmingham-resolution.pdf
California Department of Transportation	Deputy Directive 64-RI	Internal Policy	2008	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-dotpolicy.pdf
Cook County, IL	Ordinance	Legislation	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-cookcounty-ordinance.pdf
Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	Complete Streets Policy	Internal Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-la-dotpolicy.pdf
Babylon, NY	Complete Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ny-babylon-policy.pdf

Exceptions

Making a policy work in the real world requires developing a process to handle exceptions to providing for all modes in each project. The Coalition believes the following exceptions are appropriate with limited potential to weaken the policy. They follow the Federal Highway Administration’s guidance on accommodating bicycle and pedestrian travel and identified best practices frequently used in existing Complete Streets policies. Accommodations may not be necessary on corridors where:

1. Specific users are prohibited, such as interstate freeways or pedestrian malls.
2. Cost of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. We do not recommend attaching a percentage to define “excessive” as the context for many projects will require different portions of the overall project budget to be spent on the modes and users expected; additionally, in many instances the costs may be difficult to quantify. A 20% cap may be appropriate in unusual circumstances, such as where natural features (e.g. steep hillsides, shorelines) make it very costly or impossible to accommodate

all modes. A 20 percent figure should always be used in an advisory rather than absolute sense. The Coalition does not believe a lower cap is appropriate.

3. A documented absence of current and future need.

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

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

“Any exception to applying this Complete Streets Policy to a specific roadway project must be approved by the City Council, with documentation of the reason for the exception.

...Exceptions may be made when:

- *The project involves a roadway on which non-motorized use is prohibited by law. In this case, an effort shall be made to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists elsewhere.*
- *There is documentation that there is an absence of use by all except motorized users now and would be in the future even if the street were a complete street.”*

– Missoula, MT

Including one or more of the above exceptions garners two points. Additional exceptions begin to weaken the policy and may create loopholes too large to achieve the Complete Streets vision. If they are included, the policy receives one point. If a policy lists no exemptions, no points are awarded.

In addition to defining exceptions through good policy language, there must be a clear process for granting them. Policies that note

how exceptions are to be granted earn an additional three points.

Policy Examples: Exceptions

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Berwyn, IL	Ordinance No. 11-40	Legislation	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-berwyn-ordinance.pdf
Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	Internal Policy	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-in-bmcmppo-policy.pdf
New Orleans, LA	Ordinance	Legislation	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-la-neworleans-ordinance.pdf
Missoula, MT	Resolution No. 7473	Resolution	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mt-missoula-resolution.pdf
Bellevue, NE	Resolution	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ne-bellevue-resolution.pdf

Best Practice Elements

Network

An ideal Complete Streets policy recognizes the need for a connected, integrated network that provides transportation options to a resident's many potential destinations. Acknowledging the importance of a network approach earns the full five points. Additional discussion of connectivity is encouraged.

"This policy will create a comprehensive, integrated, connected transportation network for Louisiana that balances access, mobility, health and safety needs of motorists, transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, which includes users of wheelchairs and mobility aides. It ensures a fully integrated system, by planning, funding, designing, constructing, managing, and maintaining a complete and multi-modal network..."

– Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development

Jurisdiction

Creating complete streets networks is difficult because many different agencies have a stake in the planning, design, and construction of streets. They are built and maintained by state, county, and local agencies, and private developers often build new roads. When a state or Metropolitan Planning Organization's policy clearly notes that projects receiving money passing through the agency is expected to follow a Complete Streets approach, the policy is given three points. At the local level, policies that must be applied to private development receive three points.

At all levels, policies that articulate the need to work with others in achieving the Complete Streets vision receive two extra points.

"It is a goal of the Unified Government to foster partnerships with the State of Kansas, the Federal Highway Administration, the Mid-America Regional Council, surrounding counties and cities, school districts, citizens, businesses, interest groups and neighborhoods to implement the Complete Streets policy."

– Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas

Design

Communities adopting a Complete Streets policy should use the best and latest design standards available to them. Policies that clearly name current design guidance or reference using the best available receive three points toward the maximum of five. Policies that address the need for a balanced or flexible design approach receive two points toward the maximum of five. Additional discussion of design flexibility within the policy is encouraged.

“The director of DPW shall adapt, develop and adopt departmental policies, design criteria, standards, and guidelines based upon recognized best practices in street design, construction and operations including but not limited to the latest editions of American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets; AASHTO Guide for Planning, Designing, and Operating Pedestrian Facilities; AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities; Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach; National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide; U.S. Access Board Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines; Highway Capacity Manual and Highway Safety Manual. In doing so, DPW shall consider methods of providing development flexibility within safe design parameters, such as context-sensitive design solutions. DPW shall also attempt to employ all solutions consistent with and sensitive to the context of the project.”

– New Orleans, Louisiana

Context Sensitivity

An effective complete streets policy must be sensitive to the community context. Given the range of policy types and their varying ability to address this issue, a policy that mentions the need to be context-sensitive nets the full five points. Additional discussion of adapting roads to fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood and development is encouraged.

“The implementation of this Policy shall reflect the context and character of the surrounding built and natural environments, and enhance the appearance of such.”

– Dayton, Ohio

Performance Measures

Communities with complete streets policies can measure success several ways, from miles of bike lanes; to percentage of the goal sidewalk network achieved; to the number of people who choose to ride public transportation. Including any measures in a Complete Streets policy nets the full five points. Direction to create measures is counted in the below section, Implementation Next Steps.

“Like any project involving the use of taxpayer dollars, Complete Streets should be continuously evaluated for success and opportunities for improvement. This policy encourages the regular gauging and reporting of implementing Complete Streets through the following performance measures:

- *User data – bike, pedestrian, transit and traffic*
- *Crash data*
- *Use of new projects by mode*
- *Compliments and complaints*
- *Linear feet of pedestrian accommodations built*
- *Number of ADA accommodations built*
- *Miles of bike lanes/trails built or striped*
- *Number of transit accessibility accommodations built*
- *Number of street trees planted*
- *Number of exemptions from this policy approved”*

– *New Hope, Minnesota*

Policy Examples: Performance Measures

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Winter Park, FL	Resolution No. 2083-11	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-fl-winterpark-resolution.pdf
Baltimore, MD	Council Bill 09-0433	Resolution	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-md-baltimore-resolution.pdf
New Hope, MN	Complete Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-newhope-policy.pdf
Roanoke, VA	Resolution No. 38042-031708	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2008	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-va-roanoke-policy.pdf
La Crosse, WI	Ordinance No. 4627	Legislation	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-wi-lacrosse-ordinance.pdf

Implementation Next Steps

A formal commitment to the Complete Streets approach is only the beginning. The Coalition has identified four key steps to take for successful implementation of a policy:

1. Restructure or revise related procedures, plans, regulations, and other processes to accommodate all users on every project.
2. Develop new design policies and guides or revise existing to reflect the current state of best practices in transportation design. Communities may also elect to adopt national or state-level recognized design guidance.
3. Offer workshops and other training opportunities to transportation staff, community leaders, and the general public so that everyone understands the importance of the Complete Streets vision.
4. Develop and institute better ways to measure performance and collect data on how well the streets are serving all users.

Any recognition or discussion of the next steps to achieve Complete Streets is awarded one point. Specifying the need to take action on at least two of the four steps identified above nets three points.

Assigning oversight of or regularly reporting on implementation is critical to ensuring the policy becomes practice. Policies that identify a specific person or advisory board to oversee and help drive implementation, or policies that establish a reporting requirement receive an additional point.

Policies that change the way transportation projects are prioritized, and thus chosen for funding and construction, are awarded an additional point.

Implementation Next Steps

- “(A) Advisory Group. The City will establish an inter-departmental advisory committee to oversee the implementation of this policy. The committee will include members of Public Works, Community Development, Recreation and Community Services, and the Police Departments from the City of Baldwin Park. The committee may include representatives from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, representatives from the bicycling, disabled, youth and elderly communities and other advocacy organizations, as relevant. This committee will meet quarterly and provide a written report to the City Council evaluating the City’s progress and advise on implementation.*
- (B) Inventory. The City will maintain a comprehensive inventory of the pedestrian and bicycling facility infrastructure integrated with the City’s database and will prioritize projects to eliminate gaps in the sidewalk and bikeways networks.*
- (C) Capital Improvement Project Prioritization. The City will reevaluate Capital Improvement Projects prioritization to encourage implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements.*
- (D) Revisions to Existing Plans and Policies. The City of Baldwin Park will incorporate Complete Streets principles into: the City’s Circulation Element, Transportation Strategic Plan, Transit Plan, Traffic Safety Master Plan, Specific Plans, Urban Design Element; and other plans, manuals, rules, regulations and programs.*
- (E) Other Plans. The City will prepare, implement, and maintain a Bicycle Transportation Plan, a Pedestrian Transportation Plan, a Safe Routes to School Plan, an Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan, and a Street Tree and Landscape Master Plan.*
- (F) Storm Water Management. The City will prepare and implement a plan to transition to sustainable storm water management techniques along our streets.*
- (G) Staff Training. The City will train pertinent City staff on the content of the Complete Streets principles and best practices for implementing the policy.*
- (H) Coordination. The City will utilize inter-department project coordination to promote the most responsible and efficient use of fiscal resources for activities that occur within the public right of way.*
- (I) Street Manual. The City will create and adopt a Complete Streets Design Manual to support implementation of this policy.*
- (J) Funding. The City will actively seek sources of appropriate funding to implement Complete Streets.”*

– Baldwin Park, California

Policy Examples: Implementation Next Steps

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Baldwin Park, CA	Resolution No. 2011-028	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-baldwinpark-policy.pdf
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco, CA area)	Regional Policy for the Accommodation of Non-Motorized Users	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2006	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-mtc-policy.pdf
Lee County, FL	Resolution No. 09-11-13	Resolution	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-fl-leecounty-resolution.pdf
Helena, MT	Resolution No. 19799	Resolution	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mt-helena-resolution.pdf
New Jersey Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	Internal Policy	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-nj-dotpolicy.pdf

Highlights: Top Policies

The following tables provide an easy reference to the five top-scoring policies by jurisdiction type and popular policy approaches. Full details about the scores of these policies can be found in the appendix.

State Legislation

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
State of Minnesota	Sec. 52, Minnesota Statutes 2008, section 174.75	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-legislation.pdf
State of Connecticut	Public Act 09-154 (SB 735)	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ct-legislation.pdf
State of Hawaii	Act 054 (SB 718)	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-hi-legislation.pdf
State of Vermont	Act 0-34 (H.198)	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-vt-legislation.pdf
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	Senate Bill 1857	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-pr-legislation.pdf

State Department of Transportation Policies

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
New Jersey Department of Transportation	Policy No. 703	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-nj-dotpolicy.pdf
Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	Complete Streets Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-la-dotpolicy.pdf
California Department of Transportation	Deputy Directive 64-R1	2008	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-dotpolicy.pdf
North Carolina Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-nc-dotpolicy.pdf
District of Columbia Department of Transportation	Departmental Order 06-2010 (DDOT Complete Streets Policy)	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-dc-dotpolicy.pdf

Metropolitan Planning Organization Policies

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (Dayton, OH area)	Regional Complete Streets Policy	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-oh-mvrpc-policy.pdf
Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-oh-morpc-policy.pdf
Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-in-bmcmppo-policy.pdf
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council (Fargo, ND area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-.pdf
Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-in-mccog-policy.pdf

County Policies

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Hennepin County, MN	Complete Streets Policy	Policy Adopted by Elected Board	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-baldwinpark-policy.pdf
Cook County, IL	Ordinance	Legislation	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-mtc-policy.pdf
Wilkin County, MN	Resolution	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-fl-leecounty-resolution.pdf
Lee County, FL	Resolution No. 09-11-13	Resolution	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mt-helena-resolution.pdf
Doña Ana County, NM	Resolution 09-114	Resolution	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-nj-dotpolicy.pdf

City Ordinances

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Crystal City, MO	Ordinance	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mo-crystalcity-ordinance.pdf
Blue Island, IL	Ordinance	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-blueisland-ordinance.pdf
Herculaneum, MO	Ordinance No. 33-2010	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mo-herculaneum-ordinance.pdf
Berwyn, IL	Ordinance No. 11-40	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-il-berwyn-ordinance.pdf
New Orleans, LA	Ordinance No. 24706	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-la-neworleans-ordinance.pdf

City Resolutions

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Birmingham, AL	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-al-birmingham-resolution.pdf
Bellevue, NE	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ne-bellevue-resolution.pdf
Missoula, MT	Resolution No. 7473	2009	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mt-missoula-resolution.pdf
Battle Lake, MN	Resolution No. 06-14-2011	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-battlelake-resolution.pdf
Pipestone, MN	Resolution	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-pipestone-resolution.pdf

City Policies Adopted by Elected Board

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Link</i>
Baldwin Park, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-baldwinpark-policy.pdf
New Hope, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-newhope-policy.pdf
Azusa, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-ca-azusa-policy.pdf
Roanoke, VA	Complete Streets Policy	2008	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-va-roanoke-policy.pdf
Big Lake, MN	Resolution No. 2010-74	2010	http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-biglake-policy.pdf

Methodology

The National Complete Streets Coalition designed this analysis to be easily understood by a wide audience, both in the resulting scores and in the scoring system itself.

Each element of an ideal Complete Streets policy, as already established by the Coalition, was given a possible total of 5 points, where 5 represents fulfillment of that ideal element. Refer to the previous section for a discussion of how points are awarded. Awarding each element a total of 5 points made it simple to establish benchmarks in each category without drawing unnecessary comparisons between elements.

The Coalition believes that some elements of a policy are more important to establish than others. To reflect this, the tool uses a weighting system so that the points earned per element are then put in context of the overall policy.

The chosen weights began with a staff exercise and discussion around the elements, based on research, case studies conducted for the American Planning Association report, *Complete Streets: Best Policy and Implementation Practices*, experience in policy development, and work with communities across the country. These weights were then adjusted based on feedback from the Coalition's Steering Committee and input from attendees of the Coalition's 2011 Strategy Meeting. We simplified the weights so that they would a) add to a total possible score of 100 and b) would not require any complex mathematical tricks or rounding. We anticipate making changes to this weighting based on continued research into how policy language correlates to implementation.

The identified weight for each element is multiplied by points awarded, then divided by 5 (the highest possible number of points). For example, a policy that addresses bicycling, walking, and public transportation for people of all ages and abilities receives a total of 3 points. Those points are multiplied by 20, the weighting assigned to that policy element, and divided by 5, the highest possible number of points. For this policy element, the policy receives a score of 12 out of a possible 20.

When the scores for every element are summed, the policy will have a score between 0 and 100, with a higher number indicating it is closer to ideal.

COMPLETE STREETS

policy analysis 2011

Appendix



Smart Growth America
Making Neighborhoods Great Together



**National Complete
Streets Coalition**

www.smartgrowthamerica.org

August 2012



Complete Streets Policy Analysis 2011 is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License, permitting non-commercial use with attribution. Any of these conditions may be waived with permission.
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>

Appendix Contents

State Legislation	4
State Resolutions	6
State Executive Orders	6
State Internal Policies	6
Metropolitan Planning Organization Resolutions	8
Metropolitan Planning Organization Policies	8
County Legislation	10
County Resolution	12
County Tax Ordinance	12
County Internal Policy	14
County Policy Adopted by Elected Board	14
City Legislation	14
City Resolution	18
City Tax Ordinance	32
City Executive Order	32
City Internal Policy	32
City Policy Adopted by Elected Board	32

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

STATE LEGISLATION

State of Minnesota	Sec. 52. Minnesota Statutes 2008, section 174.75	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
State of Connecticut	Public Act 09-154 (SB 735)	2009	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
State of Hawaii	Act 054 (SB 718)	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
State of Vermont	Act 0-34 (H.198)	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	Senate Bill 1857	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
State of Michigan	Public Act 135 of 2010 (HB6151)	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
State of New York	Highway Law Section 331 (Bill S. 5411)	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
State of California	The Complete Streets Act (AB 1358)	2008	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
State of Rhode Island	Chapter 31-18: Pedestrians Section 31-18-21	1997	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
State of Illinois	Public Act 095-065 (SB0314)	2007	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
State of Wisconsin	State Statutes Section 1918gr. 84.01 (35)	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
State of Washington	Chapter 257, 2011 Laws	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
State of Massachusetts	Bicycle-Pedestrian Access Law (Chapter 90E)	1996	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
State of Colorado	Colorado Statutes 43-1-120 (HB 1147)	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	0	0.00
State of Oregon	ORS 366.514	1971	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
State of Vermont	State Statutes Chapter 23, Section 2310 (Bill S. 350)	2008	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
State of Florida	Florida Statute 335.065 (Bicycle & Pedestrian Ways)	1984	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
State of Maryland	Maryland Trans. Code Ann. Title 2 subtitle 602	2000	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	64.4	State of Minnesota	Sec. 52. Minnesota Statutes 2008, section 174.75
3	0	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	62.8	State of Connecticut	Public Act 09-154 (SB 735)
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	59.6	State of Hawaii	Act 054 (SB 718)
3	0	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	56.4	State of Vermont	Act 0-34 (H.198)
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	54.8	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	Senate Bill 1857
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	54.4	State of Michigan	Public Act 135 of 2010 (HB6151)
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	46.8	State of New York	Highway Law Section 331 (Bill S. 5411)
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	44.8	State of California	The Complete Streets Act (AB 1358)
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	33.2	State of Rhode Island	Chapter 31-18: Pedestrians Section 31-18-21
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	32.4	State of Illinois	Public Act 095-065 (SB0314)
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	30.8	State of Wisconsin	State Statutes Section 1918gr. 84.01 (35)
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	30.0	State of Washington	Chapter 257, 2011 Laws
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	28.4	State of Massachusetts	Bicycle-Pedestrian Access Law (Chapter 90E)
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	27.6	State of Colorado	Colorado Statutes 43-1-120 (HB 1147)
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	25.2	State of Oregon	ORS 366.514
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	24.4	State of Vermont	State Statutes Chapter 23, Section 2310 (Bill S. 350)
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	23.2	State of Florida	Florida Statute 335.065 (Bicycle & Pedestrian Ways)
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	21.6	State of Maryland	Maryland Trans. Code Ann. Title 2 subtitle 602

location	policy	year	intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
			points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

STATE RESOLUTION

South Carolina Department of Transportation	Commission Resolution	2003	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
---	-----------------------	------	---	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	---	---	---	---	-------	---	---	---	------	---	------

STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER

State of Delaware	Executive Order No. 6	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
-------------------	-----------------------	------	---	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------	---	---	---	---	-------	---	---	---	------	---	------

STATE INTERNAL POLICY

New Jersey Department of Transportation	Policy No. 703	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	Complete Streets Policy	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
California Department of Transportation	Deputy Directive 64-R1	2008	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
North Carolina Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Washington, DC Department of Transportation	Departmental Order 06-2010 (DDOT Complete Streets Policy)	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Colorado Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	PennDOT Design Manual 1A (Appendix J: Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklist)	2007	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	5	2.00
Virginia Department of Transportation	Policy for Integrating Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	2004	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Tennessee Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Mississippi Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Texas Department of Transportation	Guidelines Emphasizing Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	2011	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	20.4	South Carolina Department of Transportation	Commission Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	39.2	State of Delaware	Executive Order No. 6
3	0	2	5	8.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	1	4	16.00	84.8	New Jersey Department of Transportation	Policy No. 703
3	0	2	5	8.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	72.0	Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	71.2	California Department of Transportation	Deputy Directive 64-R1
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	70.4	North Carolina Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	66.4	Washington, DC Department of Transportation	Departmental Order 06-2010 (DDOT Complete Streets Policy)
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	61.2	Colorado Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	56.8	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	PennDOT Design Manual 1A (Appendix J: Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklist)
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	50.8	Virginia Department of Transportation	Policy for Integrating Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	36.0	Tennessee Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	31.6	Mississippi Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	21.2	Texas Department of Transportation	Guidelines Emphasizing Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION RESOLUTION

Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (Las Cruces, NM area)	Resolution 08-10	2008	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
San Antonio-Bexar County Metropolitan Planning Organization (San Antonio, TX area)	Resolution Supporting a Complete Streets Policy	2009	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
La Crosse Area Planning Organization (La Crosse, WI area)	Resolution 7-2011	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Region 2 Planning Commission (Jackson, MI area)	Resolution	2006	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Lawrence County, KS area)	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
St. Cloud Area Planning Organization (St. Cloud, MN area)	Resolution 2011-09	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Mid-Region Council of Governments of New Mexico (Albuquerque, NM area)	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY

Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (Dayton, OH area)	Regional Complete Streets Policy	2011	1	1.2	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	5	2.00
Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council (Fargo, ND area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	50.8	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (Las Cruces, NM area)	Resolution 08-10
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	50.4	San Antonio-Bexar County Metropolitan Planning Organization (San Antonio, TX area)	Resolution Supporting a Complete Streets Policy
3	0	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	0	0	1	1	4.00	44.4	La Crosse Area Planning Organization (La Crosse, WI area)	Resolution 7-2011
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Region 2 Planning Commission (Jackson, MI area)	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	34.0	Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Lawrence County, KS area)	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	St. Cloud Area Planning Organization (St. Cloud, MN area)	Resolution 2011-09
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	13.2	Mid-Region Council of Governments of New Mexico (Albuquerque, NM area)	Resolution
3	0	2	5	8.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	0	1	4	16.00	88.0	Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (Dayton, OH area)	Regional Complete Streets Policy
3	0	2	5	8.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	1	2	8.00	77.6	Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area)	Complete Streets Policy
3	0	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	72.0	Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy
3	0	2	5	8.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	1	2	8.00	68.8	Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council	Complete Streets Policy
3	0	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	68.0	Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY

Wilmington Area Planning Council (Wilmington, DE area)	Regional Transportation Plan 2030 Update	2007	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments (Rochester, MN area)	Resolution No. 11-1	2011	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (Portage, IN area)	Complete Streets Guidelines	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization (Viera, FL area)	Resolution 11-12	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Bi-State Regional Commission (Quad Cities IA-IL area)	Complete Streets Policy	2008	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (Cleveland, OH area)	Regional Transportation Investment Policy	2003	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco Bay area)	Regional Policy for the Accommodation of Non-Motorized Travelers	2006	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (Boise, ID area)	Complete Streets Policy	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Johnson County Council of Governments (Iowa City, IA area)	Complete Streets Policy	2006	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

COUNTY LEGISLATION

Cook County, IL	Ordinance	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Salt Lake County, UT	Ordinance No. 1672	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	0	0.00
Montgomery County, MD	County Code Chapter 49, Streets and Roads	2007	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation													
agency-funded privately-built collaborate with others points (of 5) weighted score (of 6)					design guidance flexibility & balance points (of 5) weighted score (of 20)					points (of 5) weighted score (of 12)			points (of 5) weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed oversight or reporting prioritization changes points (of 5) wegighted score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE											
																location		policy								
	3	0	0	3		4.80	3	2	5		4.00	5				8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	63.2	Wilmington Area Planning Council (Wilmington, DE area)	Regional Transportation Plan 2030 Update
	3	0	2	5		8.00	3	2	5		4.00	5				8.00	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	4.00	62.4	Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments (Rochester, MN area)	Resolution No. 11-1
	3	0	2	5		8.00	3	0	3		2.40	5				8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	48.8	Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (Portage, IN area)	Complete Streets Guidelines
	3	0	2	5		8.00	3	0	3		2.40	5				8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	47.2	Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization (Viera, FL area)	Resolution 11-12
	3	0	0	3		4.80	0	2	2		1.60	5				8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.0	Bi-State Regional Commission (Quad Cities IA-IL area)	Complete Streets Policy
	3	0	0	3		4.80	3	0	3		2.40	5				8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	42.8	Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (Cleveland, OH area)	Regional Transportation Investment Policy
	3	0	0	3		4.80	0	0	0		0.00	0				0.00	0	0.00	3	1	1	5	20.00	39.6	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco Bay area)	Regional Policy for the Accommodation of Non-Motorized Travelers
	0	0	0	0		0.00	0	2	2		1.60	5				8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (Boise, ID area)	Complete Streets Policy
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	19.6	Johnson County Council of Governments (Iowa City, IA area)	Complete Streets Policy						
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	77.6	Cook County, IL	Ordinance						
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	64.4	Salt Lake County, UT	Ordinance No. 1672						
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.4	Montgomery County, MD	County Code Chapter 49, Streets and Roads						

			intent	all users and modes				projects and phases		exceptions		network	
location	year	policy	points (of 5) weighted socre (of 6)	ped/bike ped/bike/transit ped/bike/transit + 1 ped/bike/transit + 2 all abilities all ages points (of 5) weighted socre (of 20)	new construction only new & reconstruction plus repair, operations, etc. points (of 5) weighted score (of 12)		listed exceptions approval process points (of 5) weighted score (of 16)		points (of 5) wegighted score (of 2)				

COUNTY RESOLUTION

Wilkin County, MN	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Lee County, FL	Resolution No. 09-11-13	2009	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Dona Ana County, NM	Resolution 09-114	2009	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Clay County, MN	Resolution 2011-49	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Monmouth County, NJ	Resolution	2010	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Kauai, HI	Resolution No. 2010-48 Draft 1	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Hennepin County, MN	Resolution No. 09-0058R1	2009	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Richland County, SC	Resolution to Endorse and Support a Complete Streets Policy	2009	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Johnson County, KS	Resolution No. 041-11	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Erie County, NY	Resolution	2008	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Jackson County, MI	Resolution	2006	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Spartanburg County, SC	Resolution No. 07-30	2007	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
La Plata County, CO	Resolution No 2007-33	2007	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ulster County, NY	Resolution No. 229-09	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Pierce County, WA	Resolution 2008-86s	2008	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
DuPage County, IL	Healthy Roads Initiative	2004	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

COUNTY TAX ORDINANCE

San Diego County, CA	Transnet Tax Extension (Proposition A)	2004	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Sacramento County, CA	Ordinance No. STA 04-01	2004	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation							
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	wegithed score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE	location	policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	74.4	Wilkin County, MN	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	66.0	Lee County, FL	Resolution No. 09-11-13
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	64.8	Dona Ana County, NM	Resolution 09-114
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	60.0	Clay County, MN	Resolution 2011-49
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	52.0	Monmouth County, NJ	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	48.4	Kauai, HI	Resolution No. 2010-48 Draft 1
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	41.2	Hennepin County, MN	Resolution No. 09-0058R1
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	37.2	Richland County, SC	Resolution to Endorse and Support a Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	36.4	Johnson County, KS	Resolution No. 041-11
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	35.6	Erie County, NY	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Jackson County, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	30.0	Spartanburg County, SC	Resolution No. 07-30
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	La Plata County, CO	Resolution No 2007-33
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	28.8	Ulster County, NY	Resolution No. 229-09
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Pierce County, WA	Resolution 2008-86s
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	18.0	DuPage County, IL	Healthy Roads Initiative
3	0	0	3	4.80	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	52.4	San Diego County, CA	Transnet Tax Extension (Proposition A)
3	0	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	28.4	Sacramento County, CA	Ordinance No. STA 04-01

location	policy	year	intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
			points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

COUNTY INTERNAL POLICY

Cobb County, GA	Complete Streets Policy	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Marin County, CA	Best Practice Directive for Inclusion of Multi-Modal Elements into Improvement Projects	2007	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00

COUNTY POLICY ADOPTED BY ELECTED BOARD

Hennepin County, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Ada County Highway District, ID	Resolution No. 895	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
La Crosse County, WI	Resolution No. 11-4/11	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Richland County, SC	Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

CITY LEGISLATION

Crystal City, MO	Ordinance	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Blue Island, IL	Ordinance	2011	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Herculaneum, MO	Ordinance No. 33-2010	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Berwyn, IL	Ordinance No. 11-40	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
New Orleans, LA	Ordinance No. 24706	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Spokane, WA	Ordinance	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
La Crosse, WI	Ordinance No. 4627	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Lansing Township, MI	Ordinance	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Rochester, NY	Ordinance	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
DeSoto, MO	Bill No. 45-08 (Amending Municipal Code Section 410.020)	2008	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Seattle, WA	Ordinance No. 122386	2007	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Airway Heights, WA	Ordinance C-720	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Renton, WA	Ordinance No. 5517	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Ypsilanti, MI	Ordinance	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Cobb County, GA	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	30.0	Marin County, CA	Best Practice Directive for Inclusion of Multi-Modal Elements into Improvement Projects
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	81.6	Hennepin County, MN	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	62.4	Ada County Highway District, ID	Resolution No. 895
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	57.2	La Crosse County, WI	Resolution No. 11-4/11
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	50.8	Richland County, SC	Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	83.2	Crystal City, MO	Ordinance
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	76.0	Blue Island, IL	Ordinance
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	74.4	Herculaneum, MO	Ordinance No. 33-2010
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	73.2	Berwyn, IL	Ordinance No. 11-40
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	70.8	New Orleans, LA	Ordinance No. 24706
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	62.4	Spokane, WA	Ordinance
0	3	0	3	4.80	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	60.8	La Crosse, WI	Ordinance No. 4627
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	58.0	Lansing Township, MI	Ordinance
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	2	0	2	8.00	57.6	Rochester, NY	Ordinance
0	3	0	3	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	57.2	DeSoto, MO	Bill No. 45-08 (Amending Municipal Code Section 410.020)
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	1	2	8.00	56.8	Seattle, WA	Ordinance No. 122386
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	55.2	Airway Heights, WA	Ordinance C-720
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	54.8	Renton, WA	Ordinance No. 5517
0	3	2	5	8.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	52.8	Ypsilanti, MI	Ordinance

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

CITY LEGISLATION, CONT.

Ferguson, MO	Bill Amending Article 1 of Chapter 40 of the Municipal Code	2008	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
St. Louis, MO	Board Bill No. 7	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Point Pleasant, NJ	Ordinance	2011	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Dexter, MI	Ordinance No. 2010-05	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Houghton, MI	Ordinance	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Taylor, MI	Ordinance No.	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Saline, MI	Ordinance No. 731	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Ironwood, MI	Ordinance No. 490	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
St. Ignace, MI	Ordinance No. 627	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
North Myrtle Beach, SC	Ordinance	2009	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	3	9.60	5	2.00
Cairo, WV	Ordinance	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Elizabeth, WV	Ordinance	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Ellenboro, WV	Ordinance	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Buffalo, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2008	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Cleveland, OH	Ordinance No. 798-11	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Williamston, MI	Ordinance No. 325	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Lathrup Village, MI	Ordinance No. 421-11	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Ferndale, MI	Ordinance No. 1101	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Columbia, MO	Ordinance 018097	2004	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	5	2.00
Salt Lake City, UT	Ordinance No. 4-10	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Conway, SC	Unified Development Ordinance, Article 7 – Streets and Circulation	2011	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Pittsfield Township, MI	Ordinance No. 294	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
San Francisco, CA	Public Works Code 2.4.13 (Ordinance No. 209-05)	2008	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lansing, MI	Ordinance No. 1145	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation							
agency-funded privately-built collaborate with others points (of 5) weighted score (of 6)	design guidance flexibility & balance points (of 5) weighted score (of 20)				points (of 5) weighted score (of 12)		points (of 5) weighted score (of 16)		next steps listed oversight or reporting prioritization changes points (of 5) weighted score (of 20)					TOTAL SCORE	location policy					
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	52.0	Ferguson, MO	Bill Amending Article 1 of Chapter 40 of the Municipal Code
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	52.0	St. Louis, MO	Board Bill No. 7
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	52.0	Point Pleasant, NJ	Ordinance
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.6	Dexter, MI	Ordinance No. 2010-05
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.6	Houghton, MI	Ordinance
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.6	Taylor, MI	Ordinance No.
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.6	Saline, MI	Ordinance No. 731
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.6	Ironwood, MI	Ordinance No. 490
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.6	St. Ignace, MI	Ordinance No. 627
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	50.4	North Myrtle Beach, SC	Ordinance
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	50.0	Cairo, WV	Ordinance
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	50.0	Elizabeth, WV	Ordinance
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	50.0	Ellenboro, WV	Ordinance
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	49.2	Buffalo, NY	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	48.4	Cleveland, OH	Ordinance No. 798-11
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	47.6	Williamston, MI	Ordinance No. 325
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	46.8	Lathrup Village, MI	Ordinance No. 421-11
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	46.4	Ferndale, MI	Ordinance No. 1101
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	44.0	Columbia, MO	Ordinance 018097
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	44.0	Salt Lake City, UT	Ordinance No. 4-10
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	43.2	Conway, SC	Unified Development Ordinance, Article 7 – Streets and Circulation
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	41.6	Pittsfield Township, MI	Ordinance No. 294
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	37.2	San Francisco, CA	Public Works Code 2.4.13 (Ordinance No. 209-05)
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	30.4	Lansing, MI	Ordinance No. 1145

location	policy	year	intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
			points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

CITY LEGISLATION, CONT.

Bellevue, NE	Ordinance	2011	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Burien, WA	Ordinance No. 599	2011	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Redmond, WA	Redmond Municipal Code Chapter 12.06: Complete the Streets	2007	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Honolulu, HI	Revised Charter of Honolulu Sections 6-1703, 6-1706	2006	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Issaquah, WA	Issaquah Municipal Code Chapter 12.10: Complete Streets (Ordinance No. 2514)	2007	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Edmonds, WA	Ordinance No. 3842	2011	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
San Francisco, CA	Transit First Policy	1995	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Kirkland, WA	Ordinance No. 4061	2006	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Sedro-Woolley, WA	Ordinance	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Columbus, OH	Ordinance No. 1987-2008	2008	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Albert Lea, MN	Subdivision Ordinance Section 129 (t) (Ordinance No. 124, 4d)	2009	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00

CITY RESOLUTION

Birmingham, AL	Resolution	2011	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Bellevue, NE	Resolution	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Missoula, MT	Resolution No. 7473, Providing for a Complete Streets Policy	2009	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Battle Lake, MN	Resolution No. 06-14-2011	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Pipestone, MN	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
St. Cloud, MN	Resolution 2011-11-164	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Lee's Summit, MO	Resolution No. 10-17	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Bozeman, MT	Resolution No. 4244	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Lemont, IL	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy

0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	29.2	Bellevue, NE	Ordinance
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	24.4	Burien, WA	Ordinance No. 599
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	24.0	Redmond, WA	Redmond Municipal Code Chapter 12.06: Complete the Streets
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	23.6	Honolulu, HI	Revised Charter of Honolulu Sections 6-1703, 6-1706
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	23.6	Issaquah, WA	Issaquah Municipal Code Chapter 12.10: Complete Streets (Ordinance No. 2514)
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Edmonds, WA	Ordinance No. 3842
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	17.2	San Francisco, CA	Transit First Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	16.4	Kirkland, WA	Ordinance No. 4061
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	16.4	Sedro-Woolley, WA	Ordinance
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	15.2	Columbus, OH	Ordinance No. 1987-2008
0	3	0	3	4.80	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	13.6	Albert Lea, MN	Subdivision Ordinance Section 129 (t) (Ordinance No. 124, 4d)

0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	79.2	Birmingham, AL	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	78.0	Bellevue, NE	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	75.6	Missoula, MT	Resolution No. 7473, Providing for a Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	74.4	Battle Lake, MN	Resolution No. 06-14-2011
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	74.4	Pipestone, MN	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	74.4	St. Cloud, MN	Resolution 2011-11-164
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	72.8	Lee's Summit, MO	Resolution No. 10-17
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	70.4	Bozeman, MT	Resolution No. 4244
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	70.4	Lemont, IL	Resolution

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

CITY RESOLUTION, CONT.

Breckenridge, MN	Resolution No. 12092-42/2011	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Winter Park, FL	Resolution No 2083-11	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Byron, MN	Resolution	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Stewartville, MN	Resolution 2010-32	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Hoffman Estates, IL	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Grandview, MO	Resolution 2011-24	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Pevely, MO	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Baltimore, MD	Council Bill 09-0433	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Kansas City, KS	Resolution No. 22-11	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	0	0.00
Blue Springs, MO	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Netcong, NJ	Resolution 2010-96	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Helena, MT	Resolution No. 19799	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Forest Park, IL	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Lewisboro, NY	Policy	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Sandpoint, ID	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
West Salem, WI	Resolution No. 2.11	2011	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Red Bank, NJ	Resolution No. 10-195	2010	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Franklin, PA	Resolution No. 18 of 2010	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Leawood, KS	Resolution No. 3592	2011	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lawton, OK	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Cocoa, FL	Resolution No. 2011-060	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Mesilla, NM	Resolution 2008-25	2008	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Orange City, FL	Resolution 643-11	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Tupelo, MS	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Hernando, MS	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Pascagoula, MS	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation							
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	wegthed score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE	location	policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	69.6	Breckenridge, MN	Resolution No. 12092-42/2011
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	69.2	Winter Park, FL	Resolution No 2083-11
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	66.4	Byron, MN	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	66.4	Stewartville, MN	Resolution 2010-32
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	64.4	Hoffman Estates, IL	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	64.4	Grandview, MO	Resolution 2011-24
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	64.0	Pevely, MO	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	62.8	Baltimore, MD	Council Bill 09-0433
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	62.8	Kansas City, KS	Resolution No. 22-11
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	62.0	Blue Springs, MO	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	60.0	Netcong, NJ	Resolution 2010-96
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	1	1	5	20.00	58.4	Helena, MT	Resolution No. 19799
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	57.2	Forest Park, IL	Resolution
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	56.8	Lewisboro, NY	Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	54.4	Sandpoint, ID	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	54.4	West Salem, WI	Resolution No. 2.11
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	52.0	Red Bank, NJ	Resolution No. 10-195
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.2	Franklin, PA	Resolution No. 18 of 2010
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	50.8	Leawood, KS	Resolution No. 3592
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	50.8	Lawton, OK	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	48.8	Cocoa, FL	Resolution No. 2011-060
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	48.4	Mesilla, NM	Resolution 2008-25
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	47.6	Orange City, FL	Resolution 643-11
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.8	Tupelo, MS	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.8	Hernando, MS	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.8	Pascagoula, MS	Resolution

			intent	all users and modes		projects and phases		exceptions		network	
location	year	policy	points (of 5) weighted socre (of 6)	ped/bike ped/bike/transit ped/bike/transit + 1 ped/bike/transit + 2 all abilities all ages points (of 5) weighted socre (of 20)	new construction only new & reconstruction plus repair, operations, etc. points (of 5) weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions approval process points (of 5) weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5) wegighted score (of 2)				

CITY RESOLUTION, CONT.

Columbus, MS	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Titusville, FL	Resolution No. 15-2011	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
New Haven, CT	Complete Streets Order	2008	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Cape Canaveral, FL	Resolution No. 2011-09	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Milford Township, MI	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Ocean City, NJ	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Rockledge, FL	Resolution	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Elsberry, MO	Resolution 2010-002	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Orange Beach, AL	Resolution No. 10-097	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Bethlehem, NY	Resolution No. 30	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Greenville, SC	Resolution 2008-49	2008	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Allen Park, MI	Resolution 10-1214-294	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Atlas Township, MI	Resolution No. 11-02	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Gibraltar, MI	Resolution No. 011-001	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Camden, SC	Resolution	2011	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Independence, MO	Resolution 5672	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Kingston, NY	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Grantsville, WV	Resolution Providing for Complete Streets	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Brookhaven, NY	Resolution 2010-993	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Gowanda, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Cuba, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Islip, NY	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Charlottesville, VA	Resolution	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Emerson, NJ	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	3	3	9.60	0	0.00
East Hampton, NY	Resolution	2011	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation							
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE		
																			location	policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.8	Columbus, MS	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.8	Titusville, FL	Resolution No. 15-2011
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	46.8	New Haven, CT	Complete Streets Order
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.4	Cape Canaveral, FL	Resolution No. 2011-09
0	3	0	3	4.80	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	46.0	Milford Township, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	44.8	Ocean City, NJ	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	44.4	Rockledge, FL	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	42.4	Elsberry, MO	Resolution 2010-002
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	42.0	Orange Beach, AL	Resolution No. 10-097
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	41.2	Bethlehem, NY	Resolution No. 30
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	41.2	Greenville, SC	Resolution 2008-49
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	41.2	Allen Park, MI	Resolution 10-1214-294
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	41.2	Atlas Township, MI	Resolution No. 11-02
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	41.2	Gibraltar, MI	Resolution No. 011-001
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	41.2	Camden, SC	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	41.2	Independence, MO	Resolution 5672
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	40.4	Kingston, NY	Resolution
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	40.4	Grantsville, WV	Resolution Providing for Complete Streets
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Brookhaven, NY	Resolution 2010-993
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Gowanda, NY	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Cuba, NY	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Islip, NY	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Charlottesville, VA	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	38.8	Emerson, NJ	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	38.0	East Hampton, NY	Resolution

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

CITY RESOLUTION, CONT.

Anderson, SC	Resolution to Endorse and Support a Complete Streets Policy	2009	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Independence, MN	Resolution No. 10-0413-03	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Elizabethtown, NY	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Fort Myers, FL	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Linwood, NJ	Resolution No. 42	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Cascade, IA	City of Cascade Policy Statement	2006	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Pleasantville, NJ	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
West Windsor, NJ	Resolution 2010-R175	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Lawrence, NJ	Resolution No. 336-10	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Bloomfield, NJ	2011 Resolution - Establishing a Complete Streets Policy	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Knoxville, TN	Resolution No. 287-09	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Golden, CO	Resolution No. 2059	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Jackson, MI	Resolution	2006	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Hoboken, NJ	Resolution	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Everett, WA	Resolution	2008	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Clarkston, GA	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
St. Paul, MN	Resolution No. 09-213	2009	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Newport, RI	Resolution No. 2010-130	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lewis, NY	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Dubuque, IA	Resolution No. 124-11	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	3	9.60	0	0.00
Columbus, OH	Resolution	2008	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Edmond, OK	Resolution No. 11-10	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Morgantown, WV	Resolution	2007	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Traverse City, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation									
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	wegighted score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE	location		policy	
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	37.2	Anderson, SC	Resolution to Endorse and Support a Complete Streets Policy		
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	37.2	Independence, MN	Resolution No. 10-0413-03		
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	36.4	Elizabethtown, NY	Resolution		
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	36.4	Fort Myers, FL	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	36.4	Linwood, NJ	Resolution No. 42		
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	35.6	Cascade, IA	City of Cascade Policy Statement		
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	35.6	Pleasantville, NJ	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	35.2	West Windsor, NJ	Resolution 2010-R175		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	35.2	Lawrence, NJ	Resolution No. 336-10		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	35.2	Bloomfield, NJ	2011 Resolution - Establishing a Complete Streets Policy		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	34.8	Knoxville, TN	Resolution No. 287-09		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Golden, CO	Resolution No. 2059		
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Jackson, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	34.0	Hoboken, NJ	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	33.2	Everett, WA	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	33.2	Clarkston, GA	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	32.4	St. Paul, MN	Resolution No. 09-213		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	32.4	Newport, RI	Resolution No. 2010-130		
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	32.4	Lewis, NY	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	31.6	Dubuque, IA	Resolution No. 124-11		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Columbus, OH	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Edmond, OK	Resolution No. 11-10		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Morgantown, WV	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Traverse City, MI	Resolution		

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

CITY RESOLUTION, CONT.

Austin, TX	Resolution No. 020418-40	2002	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Prattville, AL	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Raritan, NJ	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Ilion, NY	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Duluth, MN	Resolution No. 10-0218	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Newport, OR	Resolution No. 3508	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Mobile, AL	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Keene, NH	R-2011-28	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Montclair, NJ	Resolution No. 233-09	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Iowa City, IA	Resolution Adopting a Complete Streets Policy for the City of Iowa City, IA and Repealing Resolution No. 07-109	2007	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Columbia, SC	Resolution No. R2010-054	2010	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Guthrie, OK	Resolution 2011-02	2011	3	3.60	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Newark, OH	Resolution 11-3A	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Vineland, NJ	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Portland, ME	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Kingsport, TN	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Miami, FL	Resolution No. 09-00274	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Topeka, KS	Resolution	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Madison, WI	Resolution No. 09-997	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Fairhope, AL	Resolution No. 1570-09	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Daphne, AL	Resolution No. 2009-111	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Harvey Cedars, NJ	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Sault Ste. Marie, MI	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Manistique, MI	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy

0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Austin, TX	Resolution No. 020418-40
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Prattville, AL	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Raritan, NJ	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	29.2	Ilion, NY	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	28.4	Duluth, MN	Resolution No. 10-0218
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	28.4	Newport, OR	Resolution No. 3508
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	28.4	Mobile, AL	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	28.4	Keene, NH	R-2011-28
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	28.0	Montclair, NJ	Resolution No. 233-09
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	27.6	Iowa City, IA	Resolution Adopting a Complete Streets Policy for the City of Iowa City, IA and Repealing Resolution No. 07-109
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	27.6	Columbia, SC	Resolution No. R2010-054
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	27.6	Guthrie, OK	Resolution 2011-02
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	26.0	Newark, OH	Resolution 11-3A
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	25.6	Vineland, NJ	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	25.2	Portland, ME	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	25.2	Kingsport, TN	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	24.4	Miami, FL	Resolution No. 09-00274
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	24.4	Topeka, KS	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	24.4	Madison, WI	Resolution No. 09-997
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	23.6	Fairhope, AL	Resolution No. 1570-09
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	23.6	Daphne, AL	Resolution No. 2009-111
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	22.8	Harvey Cedars, NJ	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	22.4	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Manistique, MI	Resolution

			intent	all users and modes				projects and phases		exceptions		network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5) weighted socre (of 6)	ped/bike ped/bike/transit ped/bike/transit + 1 ped/bike/transit + 2 all abilities all ages points (of 5) weighted socre (of 20)	new construction only new & reconstruction plus repair, operations, etc. points (of 5) weighted score (of 12)		listed exceptions approval process points (of 5) weighted score (of 16)		points (of 5) wegighted score (of 2)				

CITY RESOLUTION, CONT.

Novato, CA	Resolution	2007	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Novi, MI	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Berkley, MI	Resolution 48-10	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Spokane, WA	Resolution No. 2010-0018	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Clawson, MI	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Allegan, MI	Resolution 10.42	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Berrien Springs, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Birmingham, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Owosso, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Wayland, MI	Resolution No. 2011-10	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Pawtucket, RI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Belmont, WV	Resolution Providing for Complete Streets	2011	1	1.20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	12.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Fairfax, CA	Resolution No. 2527	2008	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
San Anselmo, CA	Bicycle Master Plan Appendix B: Complete Streets Resolution	2008	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Holland, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ross, CA	Resolution No. 1718	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Frenchtown, NJ	Resolution 2011-36	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Maywood, NJ	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Flint, MI	Resolution No. ____	2009	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Hamtramck, MI	Resolution 2010-120	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Mackinaw City, MI	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Linden, MI	Resolution	2010	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Acme Township, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Burt Township, MI	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation									
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	wegighted score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE	location		policy	
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	21.2	Novato, CA	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Novi, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Berkley, MI	Resolution 48-10	
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	21.2	Spokane, WA	Resolution No. 2010-0018		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Clawson, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Allegan, MI	Resolution 10.42		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	21.2	Berrien Springs, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Birmingham, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	21.2	Owosso, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Wayland, MI	Resolution No. 2011-10		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	21.2	Pawtucket, RI	Resolution		
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	21.2	Belmont, WV	Resolution Providing for Complete Streets		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	20.4	Fairfax, CA	Resolution No. 2527		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	20.4	San Anselmo, CA	Bicycle Master Plan Appendix B: Complete Streets Resolution		
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	20.4	Holland, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	20.4	Ross, CA	Resolution No. 1718		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	19.6	Frenchtown, NJ	Resolution 2011-36		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	19.6	Maywood, NJ	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	19.2	Flint, MI	Resolution No. ____		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Hamtramck, MI	Resolution 2010-120		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Mackinaw City, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Linden, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Acme Township, MI	Resolution		
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Burt Township, MI	Resolution		

			intent	all users and modes		projects and phases		exceptions		network	
location	year	policy	points (of 5) weighted socre (of 6)	ped/bike ped/bike/transit ped/bike/transit + 1 ped/bike/transit + 2 all abilities all ages points (of 5) weighted socre (of 20)		new construction only new & reconstruction plus repair, operations, etc. points (of 5) weighted score (of 12)		listed exceptions approval process points (of 5) weighted score (of 16)		points (of 5) wegighted score (of 2)	

CITY RESOLUTION, CONT.

Escanaba, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Freemont, MI	Resolution R-11-08	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Hamburg Township, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Kinross Township, MI	Resolution 2011-11	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Lake Isabella, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ludington, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Marquette Township, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Munising, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Newbury, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Otsego, MI	Resolution No. 2011-18	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Oxford, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Pellston, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Pere Marquette, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Union Charter Township, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
South Kingstown, RI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Woonsocket, RI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Denville, NJ	Resolution	2010	1 1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ridgewood, NJ	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Chapel Hill, NC	Resolution	2011	5 6.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Roeland Park, KS	Resolution No. 611	2011	1 1.20	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Oxford, MS	Resolution	2011	5 6.00	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Grand Rapids, MI	Resolution	2011	1 1.20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Spartanburg, SC	Resolution	2006	1 1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	2	2	4.80	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

jurisdiction		design		context	measures	implementation														
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	wegighted score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE	location	policy

0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Escanaba, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Freemont, MI	Resolution R-11-08
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Hamburg Township, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Kinross Township, MI	Resolution 2011-11
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Lake Isabella, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Ludington, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Marquette Township, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Munising, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Newbury, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Otsego, MI	Resolution No. 2011-18
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Oxford, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Pellston, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Pere Marquette, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Union Charter Township, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	South Kingstown, RI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	17.2	Woonsocket, RI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	17.2	Denville, NJ	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	15.6	Ridgewood, NJ	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	14.0	Chapel Hill, NC	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	13.2	Roeland Park, KS	Resolution No. 611
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	13.2	Oxford, MS	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	9.2	Grand Rapids, MI	Resolution
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	6.0	Spartanburg, SC	Resolution

location	policy	year	intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
			points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit + 2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair, operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 2)

CITY TAX ORDINANCE

Seattle, WA	Bridging the Gap	2006	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
-------------	------------------	------	---	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------	---	---	---	---	-------	---	---	---	------	---	------

CITY EXECUTIVE ORDER

Nashville, TN	Executive Order No. 40	2010	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
Salt Lake City, UT	Executive Order on Complete Streets	2007	5	6.00	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	3	5	16.00	0	0.00
Philadelphia, PA	Executive Order No. 5-09	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

CITY INTERNAL POLICY

Denver, CO	Complete Streets Policy	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Chicago, IL	Safe Streets for Chicago	2006	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Midland, MI	Complete Streets Policy	2010	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00

CITY POLICY ADOPTED BY ELECTED BOARD

Baldwin Park, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
New Hope, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Azusa, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Roanoke, VA	Complete Streets Policy	2008	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Big Lake, MN	Resolution No. 2010-74	2010	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Festus, MO	Resolution No. 3924 1/2	2010	1	1.20	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Des Plaines, IL	Complete Streets Policy	2011	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Rochester, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Highland Park, IL	Preliminary Policy	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Babylon, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Dayton, OH	Livable Streets Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	3	5	16.00	5	2.00
Las Cruces, NM	Resolution 09-301	2009	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00
Grant-Valkaria, FL	Resolution No. 07-2011	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	5	2.00
Roswell, GA	Resolution 2009-03-10	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation					TOTAL SCORE		
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 20)		location	policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	56.8	Seattle, WA	Bridging the Gap
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	50.0	Nashville, TN	Executive Order No. 40
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	35.6	Salt Lake City, UT	Executive Order on Complete Streets
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	33.2	Philadelphia, PA	Executive Order No. 5-09
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	52.4	Denver, CO	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Chicago, IL	Safe Streets for Chicago
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	24.4	Midland, MI	Complete Streets Policy
0	3	2	5	8.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	1	1	5	20.00	92.8	Baldwin Park, CA	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	0	1	4	16.00	88.0	New Hope, MN	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	76.8	Azusa, CA	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	76.8	Roanoke, VA	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	76.0	Big Lake, MN	Resolution No. 2010-74
0	3	2	5	8.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	75.2	Festus, MO	Resolution No. 3924 1/2
0	3	2	5	8.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	74.4	Des Plaines, IL	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	74.4	Rochester, MN	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	1	0	4	16.00	72.8	Highland Park, IL	Preliminary Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	72.0	Babylon, NY	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	72.0	Dayton, OH	Livable Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	62.4	Las Cruces, NM	Resolution 09-301
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	61.6	Grant-Valkaria, FL	Resolution No. 07-2011
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	58.4	Roswell, GA	Resolution 2009-03-10

			intent		all users and modes								projects and phases					exceptions				network	
location	policy	year	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	ped/bike	ped/bike/transit	ped/bike/transit + 1	ped/bike/transit +2	all abilities	all ages	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	new construction only	new & reconstruction	plus repair; operations, etc.	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	listed exceptions	approval process	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	points (of 5)	wegithed score (of 2)
CITY POLICY ADOPTED BY ELECTED BOARD, CONT.																							
Rockville, MD	Complete Streets Policy	2009	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	3	3	9.60	5	2.00
Falcon Heights, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Suwanee, GA	Ordinance No. 2009-005	2009	5	6.00	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Ishpeming, MI	Resolution 2011-01	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	3	4	12.80	0	0.00
Dunwoody, GA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	0	2	2	4.80	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Billings, MT	Resolution	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Independence, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	3	3.60	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	8.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Coeur d'Alene, ID	Resolution 09-021	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	1	5	20.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	1	0	1	3.20	5	2.00
Marquette, MI	Complete Streets Guiding Principles	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	12.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
San Antonio, TX	Complete Streets Policy	2011	1	1.20	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00
Des Moines, IA	Complete Streets Policy	2008	5	6.00	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	2	0	2	6.40	0	0.00
North Little Rock, AR	Resolution No. 74-25	2009	3	3.60	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	16.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	1	0	1	3.20	0	0.00
Palm Bay, FL	Resolution No. 2011-22	2011	3	3.60	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	16.00	0	3	0	3	7.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Concord, NH	Comprehensive Transportation Policy	2010	5	6.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	0	3	2	5	12.00	0	0	0	0.00	5	2.00

jurisdiction					design				context		measures		implementation							
agency-funded	privately-built	collaborate with others	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 6)	design guidance	flexibility & balance	points (of 5)	weighted socre (of 20)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 12)	points (of 5)	weighted score (of 16)	next steps listed	oversight or reporting	prioritization changes	points (of 5)	wegighted score (of 20)	TOTAL SCORE	location	policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00		56.8	Rockville, MD
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	56.0	Falcon Heights, MN	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	55.2	Suwanee, GA	Ordinance No. 2009-005
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	54.8	Ishpeming, MI	Resolution 2011-01
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	1	0	1	4.00	52.8	Dunwoody, GA	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	0	0	3	12.00	52.4	Billings, MT	Resolution
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	1	0	2	8.00	52.0	Independence, MN	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	2	2	3.20	3	2	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	51.2	Coeur d'Alene, ID	Resolution 09-021
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	0	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	0	0	1	4.00	44.0	Marquette, MI	Complete Streets Guiding Principles
0	0	0	0	0.00	0	2	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	40.8	San Antonio, TX	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	39.6	Des Moines, IA	Complete Streets Policy
0	0	0	0	0.00	3	2	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	38.8	North Little Rock, AR	Resolution No. 74-25
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	38.0	Palm Bay, FL	Resolution No. 2011-22
0	0	2	2	3.20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	27.2	Concord, NH	Comprehensive Transportation Policy

