



**Smart Growth America**  
Making Neighborhoods Great Together



**National Complete  
Streets Coalition**



## The Best Complete Streets Policies of 2014

February 2015



**Smart Growth America**  
Making Neighborhoods Great Together



**National Complete  
Streets Coalition**

**The National Complete Streets Coalition**, a program of Smart Growth America, is a non-profit, non-partisan alliance of public interest organizations and transportation professionals committed to the development and implementation of Complete Streets policies and practices. A nationwide movement launched by the Coalition in 2004, Complete Streets is the integration of people and place in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation networks. To date, over 700 agencies have adopted Complete Streets policies.

**Smart Growth America** is the only national organization dedicated to researching, advocating for, and leading coalitions to bring better development to more communities nationwide. From providing more sidewalks to ensuring more homes are built near public transportation or that productive farms remain a part of our communities, smart growth helps make sure people across the nation can live in great neighborhoods.

For additional information, visit [www.smartgrowthamerica.org/completestreets](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/completestreets).

Cover photo: Separated bike lanes on Guadalupe Street in Austin, TX. Photo courtesy of the City of Austin.



# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
What is a Complete Streets policy? .....	1
<b>National trends in Complete Streets policies .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>The top Complete Streets policies of 2014.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Turning policy into practice .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix A: Scoring methodology .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Elements of a Complete Streets policy.....	8
A note on plans and design guidance.....	20
<b>Appendix B: Index of Complete Streets policy scores .....</b>	<b>21</b>

# Executive Summary

In neighborhoods across the country, residents and community leaders are increasingly looking to their transportation departments for streets designed for more than just automobile traffic. They are asking for streets that are safer for people walking and bicycling, better fit the local neighborhood, reflect resident cultures, and make visiting local shops and restaurants more attractive.

**In 2014, more than 70 jurisdictions adopted Complete Streets policies.** These laws, resolutions, agency policies, and planning and design documents establish a process for selecting, funding, planning, designing, and building transportation projects that allow safe access to destinations for everyone, regardless of age, ability, income, or ethnicity, and no matter how they travel.

**Nationwide, a total of 712 jurisdictions now have Complete Streets policies in place, including 30 states, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.**

Fifty-eight regional planning organizations, 58 counties, and 564 municipalities in 48 states have adopted such policies to create safer, multimodal transportation networks.

The National Complete Streets Coalition examines and scores Complete Streets policies each year, comparing adopted policy language to the ideal. Ideal policies refine a community's vision for transportation, provide for many types of users, complement community needs, and establish a flexible project delivery approach necessary for an effective Complete Streets process and outcome. Different types of policy statements are included in this examination, including legislation, resolutions, executive orders, departmental policies, and policies adopted by an elected board.

**Eleven agencies led the nation in creating and adopting comprehensive Complete Streets policies in 2014.** These policies are a model for communities across the country. They are:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. <a href="#">Ogdensburg, NY</a>          | 6. <a href="#">Acton, MA</a> (tie)   |
| 2. <a href="#">Troy, NY</a>                | 6. <a href="#">Middleton, MA</a> (tie)   |
| 3. <a href="#">Lakemoor, IL</a> (tie)      | 6. <a href="#">Reading, MA</a> (tie)   |
| 3. <a href="#">Dawson County, MT</a> (tie) | 6. <a href="#">Salem, MA</a> (tie)   |
| 3. <a href="#">Austin, TX</a> (tie)        | 10. <a href="#">Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</a> (tie) |
|  | 10. <a href="#">Stoughton, MA</a> (tie)  |

The National Complete Streets Coalition ranks each year's new Complete Streets policies to celebrate the people who developed exceptional policy language and to provide leaders at all levels of government with examples of strong Complete Streets policies. Adopting a strong Complete Streets policy is one step toward developing communities that are safe, accessible, and affordable for everyone.

# Introduction

In neighborhoods across the country, residents and community leaders increasingly expect more from transportation investments than roads designed for just cars and trucks. They are powering a national movement for Complete Streets. A Complete Streets approach integrates the needs of people and place in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation networks. In doing so, streets become safer for people of all ages and abilities and better support overall public and economic health.

Complete Streets redefines what a transportation network looks like, which goals a transportation agency should meet, and how a community prioritizes transportation spending. A Complete Streets approach breaks down the traditional separation between planning and designing for driving, transit, walking, and bicycling. Instead, it aims for an integrated, comprehensive transportation system that supports safe travel for people of all ages and abilities, whether walking, bicycling, using public transportation, or driving.

Local Complete Streets efforts generally are the fruit of diverse alliances among advocates for older adults, public health agencies, transportation practitioners, bicycling and walking proponents, and many others. Policies may be adopted as part of public health campaigns to create safe, attractive environments for physical activity; as a way to address pressing safety concerns; or as part of a comprehensive economic development strategy.

## What is a Complete Streets policy?

Complete Streets policies represent a community's intent to select, design, and build transportation projects that provide safe, attractive transportation options to homes, workplaces, schools, healthcare facilities, civic and cultural centers, and other important destinations. They direct decision-makers to consistently fund, plan for, construct, operate, and maintain community streets to accommodate all anticipated users, including people walking, bicycling, taking public transportation and driving cars and commercial vehicles.

The National Complete Streets Coalition recognizes many types of statements as official commitments to a Complete Streets approach, including legislation, resolutions, executive orders, departmental policies, policies adopted by an elected board, comprehensive or master plans, and design guidance.

Complete Streets legislation requires the needs of all users to be addressed in transportation projects by changing city, county, or state codes or statutes. Resolutions are non-binding official statements from a jurisdiction's legislative branch and executive orders are high-level directives issued by a mayor or governor. Departmental policies are adopted by the leadership of a jurisdiction's transportation agency, office, or department without action from an elected body. Policies adopted by an elected board are policy statements, usually developed by a group of stakeholders, and are approved by an elected governing body via an adopting resolution or ordinance. Some communities also incorporate Complete Streets into comprehensive or transportation master plans or through updates to street design guidance and standards. With the exception of plans and design guidance, this report analyzes all other types of policy documents.

The concept of "Complete Streets" is itself simple and inspiring, but a policy must do more than simply affirm support for the concept. The best policies refine a community's vision for

transportation, complement community needs, and establish a flexible approach necessary for an effective Complete Streets process and outcome.

The National Complete Streets Coalition promotes a comprehensive policy model that includes ten ideal elements:

1. **Vision:** The policy establishes a motivating vision for why the community wants Complete Streets: to improve safety, promote better health, increase efficiency, improve the convenience of choices, or for other reasons.
2. **All users and modes:** The policy specifies that “all modes” includes walking, bicycling, riding public transportation, driving trucks, buses and automobiles and “all users” includes people of all ages and abilities.
3. **All projects and phases:** All types of transportation projects are subject to the policy, including design, planning, construction, maintenance, and operations of new and existing streets and facilities.
4. **Clear, accountable exceptions:** Any exceptions to the policy are specified and approved by a high-level official.
5. **Network:** The policy recognizes the need to create a comprehensive, integrated and connected network for all modes and encourages street connectivity.
6. **Jurisdiction:** All other agencies that govern transportation activities can clearly understand the policy’s application and may be involved in the process as appropriate.
7. **Design:** The policy recommends use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines, while recognizing the need for design flexibility to balance user needs in context.
8. **Context sensitivity:** The current and planned context (buildings, land use, and transportation needs) is considered when planning and designing transportation solutions.
9. **Performance measures:** The policy includes performance standards with measurable outcomes.
10. **Implementation steps:** Specific next steps for implementing the policy are described.

These elements were developed in consultation with members of the Coalition’s Steering Committee and workshop instructors, and through its ongoing research. Based on decades of collective experience in transportation planning and design, the elements are a national model of best practices that can be used in nearly all types of policies at all levels of governance.

This report evaluates the language of Complete Streets policies based on the elements outlined above, and recognizes those communities that have integrated best practices into their own policy documents. This report focuses on how well-written policy language adopted to date compares to the Coalition’s ten elements of an ideal policy.


More information about the ten elements is detailed in the [Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook](#), a companion to this report. The *Workbook* helps counties and cities examine current practices and Complete Streets needs to develop locally appropriate language that draws from the best practices identified in this report.

Clear, direct, and accountable written policies are the first step in creating an inclusive, multimodal transportation decision-making process. However, they alone do not ensure Complete Streets outcomes. For resources and information on policy implementation, visit [www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/implementation](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/implementation).

## National trends in Complete Streets policies

This year continued an upward national trend of Complete Streets policy adoption since 2005 (see Figure 1).

FIGURE 1  
Number of Complete Streets policies nationwide, 2005–2014



Today, Complete Streets policies are in place in 712 jurisdictions nationwide, including 30 states, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia; 58 regional planning organizations; 58 counties; and 564 municipalities. Seventy-four of those policies were adopted in 2014 alone.

Small towns and big cities alike see Complete Streets as integral to their transportation goals (see Figure 2). Of the 564 municipalities with Complete Streets policies, 218 (or 39 percent) are suburban communities with fewer than 30,000 residents. Small towns, often in rural areas, comprise almost 20 percent of the total policies. On the other end of the spectrum, 11 of the 15 most populous cities in the country have committed to Complete Streets with a policy.

The types of policies in place are similarly diverse (see Figure 3). While most take the form of a resolution adopted by a city or county council, jurisdictions are commonly using changes to municipal code and the adoption of city policies to direct the use of a Complete Streets approach. City policies adopted by an elected board continue to grow in prevalence, representing 39 percent of all policies adopted in 2014, up from 31 percent of policies adopted in 2013, and 21 percent of all policies overall. Of the ten top scoring policies in 2014, 60 percent are this type of policy.

In 2014, non-binding resolutions represented 35 percent of all adopted policies; over all years, this type of policy composes just under 46 percent of all adopted Complete Streets policies. Sixteen percent of Complete Streets policies were adopted as legislation in 2014; such statutory changes make up 15 percent of the total number of Complete Streets policies.

Policy adoption was most evident in New Jersey this year, where 22 jurisdictions adopted policies, and in Massachusetts, where 8 new jurisdictions adopted policies and nearly doubled the state's total number of policies. Overall, the states of New Jersey, with 118, and Michigan, with 81, are by far the national leaders in total numbers of jurisdictions with adopted policies, while California (53), New York (53), and Florida (49) are adding to their totals.

FIGURE 2

### Municipalities with Complete Streets policies by size, 1971-2014




FIGURE 3

### Complete Streets policies by type, 1971-2014







FIGURE 4  
Median Score of Complete Streets policies, 2006-2014



The typical Complete Streets policy has become increasingly well written, as reflected in an upward trend in the annual median scores of policies reviewed by the Coalition (see Figure 4). The median score of policies adopted in 2014 was 62.0, up from 51.6 in 2013 and a median score of 46.4 among all adopted policies.


Looking at the specific aspects that make for stronger Complete Streets policies, policies are increasingly likely to cover more types of users and travel modes, including specific mentions of people of all ages and abilities. In 2014, 83 percent of policies analyzed covered all ages (versus 73 percent of policies overall); 88 percent covered all abilities (versus 86 percent overall); and 83 percent mentioned both groups of users (versus 72 percent overall).

Adopting a Complete Streets policy is the first step in creating streets that are safe and comfortable for all types of people. The Coalition recommends that specific next steps be included in policy language to ensure integration of Complete Streets into the transportation process. Our analysis shows that the number of newly adopted policies with specific implementation steps continues to grow. Of the policies adopted last year, 71 percent named at least one implementation activity, and 45 percent included at least two of the next steps recommended by the Coalition. On top of that, 37 percent identified a specific person or committee to oversee implementation or required regular public reporting on progress. Among all adopted policies, 53 percent name at least one implementation activity, and 24 percent include two or more steps; 20 percent of all policies name a responsible party or require reporting. For more on implementation activities, see [www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/implementation](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/implementation).

## The top Complete Streets policies of 2014

Communities across the country adopted Complete Streets policies in 2014 providing for safe access to destinations for everyone, regardless of age, ability, income, ethnicity or how they travel. In total, 712 jurisdictions nationwide now have Complete Streets policies in place. See Figure 5, below, for the geographic distribution of last year's policies.

FIGURE 5  
Complete Streets policies passed in 2014



**Note:** This map is diagrammatic, and actual policy locations may be slightly different than are represented here.

The Coalition evaluated every Complete Streets policy passed in 2014 for the strength of its language. Policies were awarded up to five points for how well they fulfilled each of the ten elements outlined on page 2. Scores were weighted to emphasize the more important elements of a written policy. For full scoring methodology, see Appendix A on page 8. For a full list of policies, see the Complete Streets Atlas available on the Coalition's website.

Last year, 74 states, regions, counties, and cities adopted Complete Streets policies. The policies in Table 1 are those that garnered the top scores across all ten elements.

TABLE 1

## The top Complete Streets policies of 2014

Rank	Jurisdiction	Policy	Score
1	Ogdensburg, NY	<a href="#">Ordinance #3 of 2014</a>	92.8
2	Troy, NY	<a href="#">City Code Chapter 271 – Complete Streets</a>	91.2
3	Lakemoor, IL	<a href="#">Resolution No. 14-R-11</a>	88.8
3	Dawson County, MT	<a href="#">Resolution No. 2014-28</a>	88.8
3	Austin, TX	<a href="#">Complete Streets Ordinance</a>	88.8
6	Acton, MA	<a href="#">Complete Streets Policy</a>	87.2
6	Middleton, MA	<a href="#">Complete Streets Policy</a>	87.2
6	Reading, MA	<a href="#">Complete Streets Policy</a>	87.2
6	Salem, MA	<a href="#">Complete Streets Policy</a>	87.2
10	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, CA	<a href="#">Complete Streets Policy</a>	86.4
10	Stoughton, MA	<a href="#">Complete Streets Policy</a>	86.4

## Turning policy into practice

The Coalition is encouraged that so many communities have agreed to Complete Streets policies, and that many of these policies include specific implementation steps. The guidance provided here and in the [Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook](#) aims to help those charged with policy writing set appropriate and achievable goals for implementation activities.

This report focuses on the strength of the language used in Complete Streets policies. Scores from this policy analysis may not directly translate to a community's success in updating transportation processes and procedures and building projects.

Strong written policies are the first step in creating an inclusive, multimodal transportation decision-making process. Transportation agencies, community leaders, and residents must continue working to ensure all projects are designed with a Complete Streets approach in mind. Full implementation requires agencies to make additional changes, including new project development processes, design standards, educational and outreach efforts, and performance measures. Policies that look good on paper are of little value if communities do not use them to change practices and put projects on the ground. The Coalition's website includes more specific information to ensure a policy's vision translates into on-the-ground change:

[www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/implementation](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/implementation).

## Appendix A: Scoring methodology

Our ranking of top Complete Streets policies both celebrates the communities that have done exceptional work in the past year and provides examples for other communities to follow in writing or updating their own Complete Streets policies.

The following section provides greater detail about the criteria used in evaluating Complete Streets policies. It is intended to help communities write the best Complete Streets policy possible. For communities with an existing Complete Streets policy, the following section may provide ideas for improvements or, perhaps, reasons to boast. More information about writing Complete Streets policies is available in the companion [Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook](#).

The National Complete Streets Coalition designed this scoring system to be transparent, so that both the scores and the method at arriving at those scores are meaningful to a wide audience. To begin, every policy was compared to the ten elements of an ideal policy, established by the Coalition in 2005. For each element represented in the policy, a total of 5 points is possible, where 5 represents fulfillment of that ideal element.

### Elements of a Complete Streets policy

#### 1. Vision and intent

A strong vision inspires 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. Visions cannot be empirically compared across policies, so this criterion compares the strength and clarity of each policy's commitment to Complete Streets. 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 to fulfill the policy's intent.

- 5 points: The strongest policies are those that are clear in intent, saying facilities that meet the needs of people traveling on foot or bicycle “shall” or “must” be included in transportation projects. Full points also are awarded to policies in which the absolute intent of the policy is obvious and direct, even if they do not use the words “shall” or “must,” because there is a complete lack of other equivocating language.
- 3 points: Many policies are clear in their intent—defining what a community expects from the policy—but use equivocating language that waters down the directive. For example, an average policy says that the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists “will be considered” or “may be included” as part of the process.
- 1 point: 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 perpetuates 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.”



## MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: VISION AND INTENT

### Troy, NY

“The city shall design, build, operate and maintain a safe, reliable, efficient, integrated and connected multimodal network that will provide access, mobility, safety, and connectivity for all users.”

## 2. All users and modes

No policy is a Complete Streets policy without a clear statement affirming 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. It is therefore a requirement to include both modes—walking and bicycling—in the policy before it can be further analyzed. Beyond the type of user is a more nuanced understanding that not all people who move by a certain mode are the same.

- 3 points: Policy includes two more modes, in addition to walking, bicycling, and public transportation. Such modes include cars, freight traffic, emergency response vehicles, or equestrians.
- 2 points: Policy includes one more mode, in addition to walking, bicycling, and public transportation.
- 1 point: Policy includes public transportation, in addition to walking and bicycling.
- 0 points: Policy includes walking and bicycling only.

The needs of people—young, old, with disabilities, without disabilities—are integral to great Complete Streets policies. Two additional points are available, awarded independently of each other and the above points for modes.

- 1 point: A policy references the needs of people young and old.
- 1 point: A policy includes the needs of people of all abilities.

## MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: ALL USERS AND MODES

### Baton Rouge, LA

“Roadway projects shall be designed and planned, to the greatest extent possible, to accommodate all users of the transportation system, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, truckers, and emergency responders, while respecting the access needs of adjacent land uses. Special attention in the design and planning of a project shall be given to addressing the needs of people with disabilities and the elderly.”

### 3. All 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.

- 3 points: Policy applies to reconstruction and new construction projects.
- 2 points: Policy clearly includes maintenance, operations, resurfacing, repaving, or other types of changes to the transportation system.
- 0 points: Policy does not apply to projects beyond newly constructed roads, or is not clear regarding its application.

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: ALL PROJECTS AND PHASES

##### Ogdensburg, NY

“A. All City-owned transportation facilities in the public right-of-way including, but not limited to, streets, bridges and all other connecting pathways shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so that users of all ages and abilities can travel safely and independently.

B. Privately constructed streets and parking lots shall adhere to this policy.

...

D. The City shall approach every transportation improvement and project phase as an opportunity to create safer, more accessible streets for all users. These phases include, but are not limited to: planning, programming, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, construction engineering, reconstruction, operation, and maintenance. Other changes to transportation facilities on streets and rights-of-way, including capital improvements, re-channelization projects and major maintenance, must also be included.”

### 4. Clear, accountable exceptions

Making a policy work in the real world requires a process for 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.

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

- to accommodate all modes. The Coalition does not believe a cap lower than 20 percent is appropriate, and any cap should always be used in an advisory rather than absolute sense.
3. A documented absence of current and future need.

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

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

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

- 5 points: Policy includes one or more of the above exceptions—and no others—and stating who is responsible for approving exceptions.
- 4 points: Policy includes any exceptions, including those that weaken the intent of the Complete Streets policy, and stating who is responsible for approval.
- 3 points: Policy includes one or more of the above exceptions—and no others—but does not assign responsibility for approval.
- 1 point: Policy includes any exceptions, including those that weaken the intent of the policy, but does not assign responsibility for approval.
- 0 points: Policy lists no exceptions.

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: EXCEPTIONS

##### Stoughton, MA

“Exceptions to the Complete Streets Policy may be granted by the Town of Stoughton Street Commissioners which include:

1. Transportation networks where specific users are prohibited by law, such as interstate freeways or pedestrian malls. An effort will be made, in these cases for accommodations elsewhere.
2. Where cost or impacts of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use.
3. Documentation of an absence of current and future need.”

## 5. 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. Approaching transportation projects as part of the overall network—and not as single segments—is vital for ensuring safe access to destinations. Successful Complete Streets processes recognize that all modes do not receive the same type of accommodation and space on every street, but that everyone can safely and conveniently travel across the network. The Coalition encourages additional discussion of connectivity, including block size and intersection density.

- 5 points: Policy simply acknowledges the importance of a network approach.
- 0 points: Policy does not reference networks or connectivity.

### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: NETWORK

#### Lakemoor, IL

"The Village shall strive to create a comprehensive, integrated and connected network of transportation options for all modes of conveyance, designed and operated to enable appropriate and safe access for all users."

## 6. Jurisdiction

Creating Complete Streets networks is difficult because many different agencies control our streets. They are built and maintained by state, county, and local agencies, and private developers often build new roads. Individual jurisdictions do have an opportunity to influence the actions of others, through funding or development review, and through an effort to work with their partner agencies on Complete Streets. These two types of activities are awarded points independently.

- 3 points: A state's or Metropolitan Planning Organization's policy clearly notes that projects receiving money passing through the agency are expected to follow a Complete Streets approach. County and municipal policy applies to private development.
- 2 points: Policy, at any level, articulates the need to work with others in achieving the Complete Streets vision.
- 0 points: Policy does not recognize the ways an agency can work with other organizations and developers to achieve Complete Streets.

### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: JURISDICTION

#### Acton, MA

"(1) All transportation infrastructure and street design and construction projects requiring funding or approval by the Town of Acton shall adhere to the Town of Acton Complete Streets Policy.



(2) Projects funded by the State or Federal government, including but not limited, Chapter 90 funds, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), MassWorks Infrastructure Program, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), or other State and Federal funds for street and infrastructure design shall adhere to the Town of Acton Complete Streets Policy, subject to and as may be modified by funding agency guidelines and standards.

(3) Private developments and related or corresponding street design and construction components shall adhere to the Town of Acton Complete Streets Policy.

(4) To the extent possible, state-owned streets shall comply with the Town of Acton Complete Streets Policy, including the design, construction, and maintenance of such streets within Town boundaries, subject to and as may be modified by MassDOT guidelines and standards.”

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: JURISDICTION

##### Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

“All relevant departments at Metro, partner agencies, and funding recipients will work towards making Complete Streets practices a routine part of everyday operations; approach every relevant project, program, and practice as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all categories of users; and work in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to maximize opportunities for Complete Streets, connectivity, and cooperation.

...

Metro will work with partner agencies and local jurisdictions to incorporate Complete Streets infrastructure into transit and highway planning and design, new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, rehabilitations, and Metro capital grant programs to improve the safety and convenience of all users, with the particular goal of creating a connected network of facilities accommodating each category of users, and increasing connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries and for anticipated future transportation investments.

...

In addition, all relevant capital grant funding recipients shall perform evaluations of how well the streets and transportation network planned, designed, implemented, and funded by Metro are serving each category of users by collecting baseline data and collecting follow-up data after project implementation.”

## 7. Design

Complete Streets implementation relies on using the best and latest design standards to maximize design flexibility. Agencies should be aware that design solutions need to balance modal and user needs. Points are awarded independently for these concepts.

- 3 points: Policy clearly names specific recent design guidance, or references using the best available.

- 2 points: Policy addresses the need for a balanced or flexible design approach.
- 0 points: Policy does not address design guidance, balancing of user needs, or design flexibility.

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: DESIGN

##### Salem, MA

“The latest design guidance, standards, and recommendations available will be used in the implementation of Complete Streets, including the most up-to-date versions of:

- The Massachusetts Department of Transportation Project Design and Development Guidebook
- The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Street Design Guide
- Pioneer Valley Planning Commission’s Healthy Community Design Toolkit
- The latest edition of American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets
- The United States Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Design Controls
- The Architectural Access Board (AAB) 521 CMR Rules and Regulations
- Documents and plans created for the City of Salem, including but not limited to:
  - Bicycle Master Plan
  - Open Space and Recreation Action Plan
  - Salem Downtown Renewal Plan.”

### 8. Context sensitivity

An effective Complete Streets policy must be sensitive to the surrounding community, its current and planned buildings, and current and expected transportation needs. Given the range of policy types and their varying ability to address this issue, a policy at minimum should mention context-sensitivity in making decisions. The Coalition encourages more detailed discussion of adapting roads to fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood and development.

- 5 points: Policy mentions community context as a factor in decision-making.
- 0 points: Policy does not mention context.

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: CONTEXT SENSITIVITY

##### Austin, TX

“The City will align land use and transportation goals, policies and code provisions to create Complete Streets solutions that are appropriate to the individual contexts; that best serve the

needs of all people using streets and the right-of-way and that support the land-use policies of the Imagine Austin Comprehensive Plan. Context sensitive design allows roadway design decisions to be more flexible and sensitive to community values, and to better balance economic, social, and environmental objectives. The City will take a flexible, innovative, and balanced approach to creating context-sensitive Complete Streets that meet or exceed national best-practice design guidelines. This includes a shift toward designing at the human scale for the needs and comfort of all people and travelers, in considering issues such as street design and width, desired operating speed, hierarchy of streets, mode balance, and connectivity. Design criteria shall not be purely prescriptive but shall be based on the thoughtful application of engineering, architectural and urban design principles.”

## 9. Performance measures

Communities with Complete Streets policies can measure success a number of different ways, from miles of bike lanes to percentage of the sidewalk network completed to the number of people who choose to ride public transportation.

- 5 points: Policy includes at least one performance measure. A direction to create measures without naming any is credited in the below section, “Implementation steps.”
- 0 points: Policy does not include any performance measures.

### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: PERFORMANCE MEASURES

#### Dawson County, MT

“Dawson County shall measure the success of this Complete Streets program using, but not limited to, the following performance measures:

- Total miles of bike lanes/trails built or striped
- Linear feet of new pedestrian accommodation
- Number of ADA accommodations built
- Number of transit accessibility accommodations built
- Number of new curb ramps installed along city streets
- Number of new streets planted
- Compliments and complaints
- Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Multimodal levels of service (LOS)
- Crosswalk and intersection improvements
- Percentage of transit stops accessible via sidewalks and curb ramps
- Rate of children walking or biking to school
- Number of approved exemptions from this policy

Within six months of program adoption, Dawson County shall create individual numeric benchmarks for each of the performance measures as a means of tracking and measuring the annual performance of the program. Yearly reports shall be posted online for each of the above measures.”

## 10. Implementation 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.

Assigning oversight of implementation or requiring progress reports is a critical accountability measure, ensuring the policy becomes practice. Policies can also influence the funding prioritization system to award those projects improving the multimodal network. Points for either type of activity are awarded independently.

- 3 points: Policy specifies the need to take action on at least two of the four steps identified above.
- 1 point: Policy includes at least one of the above four implementation steps.
- 1 point: Policy identifies a specific person or advisory board to oversee and help drive implementation, or establishes a reporting requirement.
- 1 point: Policy changes the way transportation projects are prioritized.
- 0 points: Policy does not include any implementation or accountability measures.

### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

#### Middleton, MA

“A Complete Streets Committee comprised of stakeholders, including members of relevant Town departments will be created to implement this initiative. The Complete Streets Committee will be a multidisciplinary team and members will include representation from: Department of Public Works (DPW), Board of Health, Planning, Inspection Department, Town Administrator’s office and other committees, departments or organizations as appropriate. The focus of this Committee will be ensuring the implementation of the Complete Streets Policy and, where necessary, altering existing practices and overcoming barriers that may act as impediments to implementation. In addition, this Committee will regularly update and solicit feedback on potential projects with the general public to ensure that the perspectives of the community are considered and incorporated, as appropriate.



The Town shall make Complete Streets practices a routine part of everyday operations, shall approach every transportation project and program as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all users, and shall work in coordination with other departments, agencies, and jurisdictions to achieve Complete Streets.

The Town, with input from the Complete Streets Committee shall review and either revise or develop proposed revisions to all appropriate planning documents (master plans, open space and recreation plan, etc.), zoning and subdivision codes, laws, procedures, rules, regulations, guidelines, programs, and templates to integrate Complete Streets principles in all Street Projects on streets.

The Town shall maintain a comprehensive inventory of pedestrian and bicycle facility infrastructure that will highlight projects that eliminate gaps in the sidewalk and bikeway network.

The Town will evaluate projects within the Capital Improvement Plan to encourage implementation of this Policy.

The Town will secure training for pertinent Town staff and decision-makers on both the technical content of Complete Streets principles and best practices, as well as community engagement methods for implementing the Complete Streets Policy. Training may be accomplished through workshops and other appropriate means.

The Town will utilize inter-department coordination to promote the most responsible and efficient use of resources for activities within the public way.

The Town will seek out appropriate sources of funding and grants for implementation of Complete Streets policies.

The Complete Streets Committee will develop performance measures to periodically assess the rate, success, and effectiveness of implementing the Complete Streets Policy. The Commission will determine the frequency of assessment and utilize appropriate metrics for analyzing the success of this policy...”

### **Additional elements**

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

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS

##### **Dover, NH**

“Green Streets: In addition to providing safe and accessible streets in the City of Dover, care

shall be given to incorporate best management practices for addressing storm water runoff. Wherever possible, innovative and educational storm water infrastructure shall be designed to be integrated into the construction/reconstruction or retrofit of a street.”

#### MODEL POLICY LANGUAGE: ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS

##### Austin, TX

“Complete Streets are beautiful, interesting and comfortable places for people. The design of cities begins with the design of streets, as community places where people want to be. As part of Austin’s public realm, streets shall be held to a higher standard for urban design at a human scale. Multi-modal accommodations and all City projects in the right-of-way shall be approached as opportunities to enhance the aesthetic qualities of Austin and its public realm through the thoughtful creation of place. Wherever feasible, streetscapes shall protect and include street trees and native plants, and incorporate landscape architecture, public art, pedestrian amenities and wayfinding signage, sidewalk cafes and street- facing retail, and/or other elements that enhance the attractiveness of Austin and foster healthy economic development.”

## Weighting the policy elements

The authors of this report evaluated policies based on the ten elements as described above. For a summary of the scoring system, see Table A1.

Awarding each element a total of 5 points establishes benchmarks in each category without drawing unnecessary comparisons between elements. However, 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.

The chosen weights were established through a collaborative process. An initial draft compiled evidence from 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. The National Complete Streets Coalition’s Steering Committee and attendees of the Coalition’s 2011 Strategy Meeting reviewed this draft and provided comments. Staff incorporated these comments and finally simplified the weights so that they would a) add to a total possible score of 100, and b) would not require complex mathematical tricks or rounding. Changes to this weighting are possible in the future, 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.

TABLE A1  
Policy element scoring system

Policy element	Points
<b>1. Vision and intent</b>	<i>Weight: 6</i>
Indirect: Indirect statement (“shall implement Complete Streets principles,” etc.)	1
Average: Direct statement with equivocating or weaker language (“consider,” “may”)	3
Direct: Direct statement of accommodation (“must,” “shall,” “will”)	5
<b>2. All users and modes</b>	<i>Weight: 20</i>
“Bicyclists and pedestrians” (required for consideration)	<i>Req.</i>
“Bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit”	1
“Bicyclists, pedestrians, transit,” plus one more mode	2
“Bicycles, pedestrians, transit,” plus two more modes	3
Additional point for including reference to “users of all ages”	1
Additional point for including reference to “users of all abilities”	1
<b>3. All projects and phases</b>	<i>Weight: 12</i>
Applies to new construction only	0
Applies to new and retrofit/reconstruction projects	3
Additional points if the policy clearly applies to all projects, or specifically includes repair/3R projects, maintenance, and/or operations	2
<b>4. Exceptions</b>	<i>Weight: 16</i>
No mention	0
Lists exceptions, but at least one lacks clarity or allows loose interpretation	1
Lists exceptions, none are inappropriate	2
Additional points for specifying an approval process	3
<b>5. Network</b>	<i>Weight: 2</i>
No mention	0
Acknowledge	5
<b>6. Jurisdiction</b>	<i>Weight: 8</i>
Agency-owned (assumed)	--
States and regions: agency-funded, but not agency-owned	3
Counties and cities: privately-built roads	3

Additional points for recognizing the need to work with other agencies, departments, or jurisdictions	2
<b>7. Design</b>	<i>Weight: 4</i>
No mention	0
References specific design criteria or directing use of the best and latest	3
References design flexibility in the balance of user needs	2
<b>8. Context sensitivity</b>	<i>Weight: 8</i>
No mention	0
Acknowledge	5
<b>9. Performance standards</b>	<i>Weight: 4</i>
Not mentioned and not one of next steps	0
Establishes new measures (does not count in implementation points)	5
<b>10. Implementation steps</b>	<i>Weight: 20</i>
No implementation plan specified	0
Addresses implementation in general	1
Addresses two to four implementation steps	3
Additional point for assigning oversight of implementation to a person or advisory board or for establishing a reporting requirement	1
Additional point for directing changes to project selection criteria	1

## A note on plans and design guidance

The Coalition recognizes that there are inherent differences among policy types. What can be accomplished through a legislative act is different than what might be included in a comprehensive plan, for example. This report's authors acknowledge that some elements of an ideal policy are unlikely to appear in some policy types and encourage comparison within a policy type, rather than across all types. For this reason, policies are grouped by policy type in Appendix B.

While the Coalition recognizes and counts Complete Streets policies included in community transportation master plans, comprehensive plans, general plans, and design guidance, these policies are not subjected to the numerical analysis used in this document. The scoring tool 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 a large and complex plan. The tool is also inappropriate for design standards and guidance. Though some design manuals 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. Design guidance is rarely the first Complete Streets policy adopted in a community; it is more often the realization of some earlier policy effort and part of the overall implementation process.



## Appendix B: Index of Complete Streets policy scores

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
State: Legislation																									
State: Legislation	State of West Virginia	Complete Streets Act (SB 158)	2013	1,852,994	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	84.8
State: Legislation	State of Minnesota	Sec. 52, Minnesota Statutes 2008, section 174.75	2010	5,303,925	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	64.4
State: Legislation	State of Connecticut	Public Act 09-154 (SB 735)	2009	3,574,097	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	62.8
State: Legislation	State of Hawaii	Act 054 (SB 718)	2009	1,369,301	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	59.6
State: Legislation	State of Vermont	Act 0-34 (H.198)	2011	625,741	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	56.4
State: Legislation	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	Senate Bill 1857	2010	3,725,789	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	54.8
State: Legislation	State of Michigan	Public Act 135 of 2010 (HB6151)	2010	9,883,640	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	54.4
State: Legislation	State of New York	Highway Law Section 331 (Bill S. 5411)	2011	19,378,102	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.8
State: Legislation	State of Rhode Island	Title 24, Chapter 16: Safe Access to Public Roads	2012	1,052,567	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	46.8
State: Legislation	State of California	The Complete Streets Act (AB 1358)	2008	37,253,956	5	6.00	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	44.8
State: Legislation	State of Rhode Island	Chapter 31-18: Pedestrians Section 31-18-21	1997	1,052,567	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	33.2
State: Legislation	State of Illinois	Public Act 095-065 (SB0314)	2007	12,830,632	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	32.4
State: Legislation	State of Wisconsin	State Statutes Section 1918gr. 84.01 (35)	2009	5,686,986	5	6.00	0	0.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.8
State: Legislation	State of Washington	Chapter 257, 2011 Laws	2011	6,724,540	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.0
State: Legislation	State of Massachusetts	Bicycle-Pedestrian Access Law (Chapter 90E)	1996	6,547,629	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.4
State: Legislation	State of Colorado	Colorado Statutes 43-1-120 (HB 1147)	2010	5,029,196	5	6.00	0	0.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.6
State: Legislation	State of Maryland	Maryland Trans. Code Ann. Title 2 subtitle 602, Chapter 145	2010	5,773,552	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	28.0
State: Legislation	State of Oregon	ORS 366.514	1971	3,831,074	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	25.2
State: Legislation	State of Vermont	State Statutes Chapter 23, Section 2310 (Bill S. 350)	2008	625,741	5	6.00	0	0.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.4
State: Legislation	State of Florida	Florida Statute 335.065 (Bicycle & Pedestrian Ways)	1984	18,801,310	5	6.00	0	0.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	23.2
State: Resolution																									
State: Resolution	South Carolina Department of Transportation	Commission Resolution	2003	4,625,364	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
State: Executive order																									
State: Executive order	State of Delaware	Executive Order No. 6	2009	897,934	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	39.2
State: DOT policy																									
State: DOT policy	New Jersey Department of Transportation	Policy No. 703	2009	8,791,894	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	80.8
State: DOT policy	Massachusetts Department of Transportation	Healthy Transportation Policy Directive	2013	6,547,629	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	80.8
State: DOT policy	Indiana Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	2014	6,483,802	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	74.4
State: DOT policy	Maine Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	2014	1,328,361	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	74.4
State: DOT policy	Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	Complete Streets Policy	2010	4,533,372	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	72.0
State: DOT policy	California Department of Transportation	Deputy Directive 64-R1	2008	37,253,956	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	71.2
State: DOT policy	North Carolina Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	2009	9,535,483	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	70.4
State: DOT policy	Michigan Department of Transportation	State Transportation Commission Policy on Complete Streets	2012	9,883,640	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	67.2
State: DOT policy	Minnesota Department of Transportation	MnDOT Policy OP004 and Technical Memorandum No 13-17-TS-06	2013	5,303,925	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	67.2
State: DOT policy	Washington, DC Department of Transportation	Departmental Order 06-2010 (DDOT Complete Streets Policy)	2010	601,723	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.4
State: DOT policy	Connecticut Department of Transportation	Policy No. Ex.- 31	2014	3,574,097	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	62.4
State: DOT policy	Georgia Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Design Policy	2012	9,687,653	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	62.4
State: DOT policy	Colorado Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy	2009	5,029,196	5	6.00	0	0.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	61.2
State: DOT policy	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	PennDOT Design Manual 1A (Appendix J: Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklist)	2007	12,702,379	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	56.8
State: DOT policy	Virginia Department of Transportation	Policy for Integrating Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	2004	8,001,024	5	6.00	1	4.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	50.8

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
State: DOT policy	Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration*	SHA Complete Streets Policy	2012	5,773,552	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	49.6
State: DOT policy	Florida Department of Transportation	Complete Streets Policy	2014	18,801,310	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	45.6
State: DOT policy	Tennessee Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy	2010	6,346,105	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	36.0
State: DOT policy	Mississippi Department of Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy	2010	2,967,297	1	1.20	1	4.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.6
State: DOT policy	Texas Department of Transportation	Guidelines Emphasizing Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	2011	25,145,561	3	3.60	2	8.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
Regional agency: Resolution																									
Regional agency: Resolution	Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Tampa, FL area)	Resolution 2012-1	2012	n/a	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	76.8
Regional agency: Resolution	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization (Las Cruces, NM area)	Resolution 08-10	2008	n/a	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	50.8
Regional agency: Resolution	San Antonio-Bexar County Metropolitan Planning Organization (San Antonio, TX area)	Resolution Supporting a Complete Streets Policy	2009	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	50.4
Regional agency: Resolution	La Crosse Area Planning Organization (La Crosse, WI area)	Resolution 7-2011	2011	n/a	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	44.4
Regional agency: Resolution	Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization (Santa Fe, NM area)	Resolution 2007-1	2007	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	38.8
Regional agency: Resolution	Lee County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Ft. Myers, FL area)	Resolution 09-05	2009	n/a	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	34.4
Regional agency: Resolution	Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Lawrence County, KS area)	Resolution	2011	n/a	1	1.20	1	4.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	34.0
Regional agency: Resolution	Region 2 Planning Commission (Jackson, MI area)	Resolution	2006	n/a	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
Regional agency: Resolution	Morgantown Monongalia Metropolitan Planning Organization (Morgantown, WV area)	Resolution No. 2008-02	2008	n/a	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
Regional agency: Resolution	Traverse City Transportation and Land Use Study (Traverse City, MI area)	Resolution No. 13-1	2013	n/a	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	32.4
Regional agency: Resolution	St. Cloud Area Planning Organization (St. Cloud, MN area)	Resolution 2011-09	2011	n/a	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
Regional agency: Resolution	Metropolitan Transportation Board of the Mid-Region Council of Governments (Albuquerque, NM region)	Resolution	2011	n/a	1	1.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	13.2
Regional agency: Policy																									
Regional agency: Policy	Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (Dayton, OH area)	Regional Complete Streets Policy	2011	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	88.0
Regional agency: Policy	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	Complete Streets Policy	2014	9,818,605	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	86.4
Regional agency: Policy	San Diego Association of Governments (San Diego, CA area)	Complete Streets Policy	2014	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	85.6
Regional agency: Policy	Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments (Toledo, OH area)	Complete Streets Policy	2014	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	80.8
Regional agency: Policy	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (Indianapolis, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2014	2014.03.05	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	78.4
Regional agency: Policy	Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	77.6
Regional agency: Policy	Mid-America Regional Council (Kansas City, MO area)	Complete Streets Policy	2012	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	72.8
Regional agency: Policy	Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2009	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	72.0
Regional agency: Policy	Twin Cities Area Transportation Study (Benton Harbor/St. Joseph area, MI)	Complete Streets Policy	2012	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	69.6
Regional agency: Policy	Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	68.0

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
Regional agency: Policy	Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council (Fargo, NC/Moorhead, MN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2010	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.8
Regional agency: Policy	Spokane Regional Transportation Council, WA (Spokane, WA area)	Policy for Safe and Complete Streets	2012	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	64.8
Regional agency: Policy	Champaign-Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation Study (Champaign, IL area)	Complete Streets Policy	2012	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	63.6
Regional agency: Policy	Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization (Evansville, IN area)	Complete Streets Policy	2012	n/a	3	3.60	1	4.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	63.2
Regional agency: Policy	Winston-Salem Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (Winston-Salem, NC area)	Complete Streets Policy	2013	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	62.4
Regional agency: Policy	Wilmington Area Planning Council (Wilmington, DE area)	Regional Transportation Plan 2030 Update	2007	n/a	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	60.0
Regional agency: Policy	Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments (Rochester, MN area)	Resolution No. 11-1	2011	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	58.4
Regional agency: Policy	Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (Las Vegas, NV area)	Policy for Complete Streets	2012	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.4
Regional agency: Policy	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (Washington, DC area)	Complete Streets Policy	2012	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	50.0
Regional agency: Policy	Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (Portage, IN area)	Complete Streets Guidelines	2010	n/a	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	48.8
Regional agency: Policy	Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization (Viera, FL area)	Resolution 11-12	2011	n/a	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	47.2
Regional agency: Policy	Bi-State Regional Commission (Quad Cities, IA-IL area)	Complete Streets Policy	2008	n/a	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.0
Regional agency: Policy	Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (Cleveland, OH area)	Regional Transportation Investment Policy	2003	n/a	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	0	0.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	42.8
Regional agency: Policy	Wasatch Front Regional Council (Salt Lake City, UT, area)	Complete Streets Vision, Mission, and Principles	2013	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	42.4
Regional agency: Policy	Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee, PA (Lancaster, PA area)	Complete Streets Policy Statement and Elements of a Complete Streets Program in Lancaster County	2014	n/a	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	38.8
Regional agency: Policy	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco, CA area)	Regional Policy for the Accommodation of Non-Motorized Travelers	2006	n/a	3	3.60	1	4.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	35.6
Regional agency: Policy	Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (Boise, ID area)	Complete Streets Policy	2009	n/a	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
Regional agency: Policy	Johnson County Council of Governments (Iowa City, IA area)	Complete Streets Policy	2006	n/a	5	6.00	0	0.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
County: Legislation																									
County: Legislation	Cook County, IL	Ordinance	2011	5,194,675	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	77.6
County: Legislation	Honolulu, HI	Bill No. 26 (2012)	2012	953,207	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	77.2
County: Legislation	Montgomery County, MD	County Code Chapter 49, Streets and Roads	2014	971,777	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	64.8
County: Legislation	Salt Lake County, UT	Ordinance No. 1672	2010	1,029,655	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	0	0.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	64.4
County: Legislation	St. Louis County, MO	Bill No. 238, 2013	2014	998,954	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	56.0
County: Legislation	Prince George's County, MD	Complete and Green Streets Policy (County Code Sec. 23-615)	2013	863,420	5	6.00	3	12.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	45.2
County: Legislation	Pierce County, WA	Complete Streets Ordinance (Ord# 2014-44)	2014	795,225	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.8
County: Legislation	Westchester County, NY	Act 2013-170	2013	949,113	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.4
County: Resolution																									
County: Resolution	Wilkin County, MN	Resolution	2011	6,576	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	74.4
County: Resolution	Lee County, FL	Resolution No. 09-11-13	2009	618,754	5	6.00	1	4.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	66.0
County: Resolution	Dona Ana County, NM	Resolution 09-114	2009	209,233	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	64.8
County: Resolution	Clay County, MN	Resolution 2011-49	2011	58,999	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	60.0
County: Resolution	Miami-Dade County, FL	Resolution R-995-14	2014	2,496,435	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	55.2
County: Resolution	Monmouth County, NJ	Resolution	2010	630,380	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.0
County: Resolution	DeKalb County, GA	Transportation Plan Appendix B: Complete Streets Policy	2014	691,893	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	50.8
County: Resolution	Kauai, HI	Resolution No. 2010-48 Draft 1	2010	67,091	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	48.4
County: Resolution	Camden County, NJ	Complete Streets Policy	2013	513,857	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.8
County: Resolution	Essex County, NJ	Resolution	2012	783,969	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.8
County: Resolution	Hudson County, NJ	Resolution 278-5-2012	2012	634,266	3	3.60	1	4.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	44.4
County: Resolution	Mercer County, NJ	Resolution	2012	366,513	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	42.8
County: Resolution	Hennepin County, MN	Resolution No. 09-0058R1	2009	1,152,425	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	41.2
County: Resolution	Passaic County, NJ	Resolution 201410106	2014	501,226	3	3.60	1	4.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	40.8

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
County: Resolution	Richland County, SC	Resolution to Endorse and Support a Complete Streets Policy	2009	384,504	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	37.2
County: Resolution	Johnson County, KS	Resolution No. 041-11	2011	544,179	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	36.4
County: Resolution	Erie County, NY	Resolution	2008	919,040	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	35.6
County: Resolution	Suffolk County, NY	Resolution	2012	1,493,350	3	3.60	5	20.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.8
County: Resolution	Jackson County, MI	Resolution	2006	160,248	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
County: Resolution	Spartanburg County, SC	Resolution No. 07-30	2007	284,307	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.0
County: Resolution	La Plata County, CO	Resolution No 2007-33	2007	51,334	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
County: Resolution	Middlesex County, NJ	Resolution 12-1316-R	2012	809,858	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
County: Resolution	Ulster County, NY	Resolution No. 229-09	2009	182,493	5	6.00	0	0.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.8
County: Resolution	Grand Traverse County Road Commission, MI	Resolution 13-08-03	2013	89,986	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	24.4
County: Resolution	Allegany County, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	48,946	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.0
County: Resolution	Cattaraugus County, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2009	80,317	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22.0
County: Resolution	Maui County, HI	Resolution	2012	154,834	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
County: Resolution	Pierce County, WA	Resolution 2008-86s	2008	795,225	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
County: Resolution	Nassau County, NY	Resolution	2013	1,339,532	3	3.60	3	12.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
County: Resolution	DuPage County, IL	Healthy Roads Initiative	2004	916,924	1	1.20	0	0.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	18.0
County: Tax ordinance																									
County: Tax ordinance	San Diego County, CA	Transnet Tax Extension (Proposition A)	2004	3,095,313	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	52.4
County: Tax ordinance	Sacramento County, CA	Ordinance No. STA 04-01	2004	1,418,788	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.4
County: Policy																									
County: Policy	Dawson County, MT	Resolution No. 2014-28	2014	8,966	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	88.8
County: Policy	Baltimore County, MD	Resolution 126-13	2013	805,029	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	86.4
County: Policy	Hennepin County, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2009	1,152,425	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	81.6
County: Policy	Lake County, IL	Policy on Infrastructure Guidelines for Non-motorized Travel Investments	2010	703,462	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	68.4
County: Policy	Ada County Highway District, ID	Resolution No. 895	2009	392,365	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	62.4
County: Policy	Alameda County, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	1,510,271	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	60.0
County: Policy	La Crosse County, WI	Resolution No. 11-4/11	2011	114,638	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	57.2
County: Policy	Richland County, SC	Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives & Ordinance No. 017-11HR	2010	384,504	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	54.8
County: Policy	Road Commission for Oakland County, MI	Complete Streets General Guidelines	2012	1,202,362	1	1.20	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	52.8
County: Policy	Richland County, SC	Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives	2010	384,504	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	50.8
County: Policy	Macomb County, MI	Resolution R14-137	2014	840,978	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	48.0
County: Policy	Essex County, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2012	39,370	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	48.0
County: Policy	Polk County, FL	Complete Streets Policy	2012	602,095	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	45.6
County: Policy	Cook County, IL	Complete Streets Policy	2009	5,194,675	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	39.6
County: Policy	Cobb County, GA	Complete Streets Policy	2009	688,078	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
County: Policy	Marin County, CA	Best Practice Directive for Inclusion of Multi-Modal Elements into Improvement Projects	2007	252,409	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.0
City: Legislation																									
City: Legislation	Indianapolis, IN	Chapter 431, Article VIII	2012	820,445	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	92.8
City: Legislation	Ogdensburg, NY	Ordinance #3 of 2014	2014	11,344	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	92.8
City: Legislation	Troy, NY	City Code Chapter 271 - Complete Streets	2014	50,129	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	91.2
City: Legislation	Austin, TX	Complete Streets Ordinance	2014	790,390	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	88.8
City: Legislation	Ocean Shores, WA	Ordinance No. 916	2012	5,569	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	84.8
City: Legislation	Knoxville, TN	Ordinance No. O-204-2014	2014	178,874	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	84.0
City: Legislation	Crystal City, MO	Ordinance	2010	4,855	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	83.2
City: Legislation	Chattanooga, TN	City Code II Ch. 32, Art. XIV	2014	167,674	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	83.2
City: Legislation	Oak Park, IL	Complete Streets Policy	2012	51,878	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	80.0
City: Legislation	Clayton, MO	Bill No. 6294	2012	15,939	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	79.2
City: Legislation	Leslie, MI	Ordinance No. 202	2012	1,851	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	76.8
City: Legislation	Blue Island, IL	Ordinance	2011	23,706	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	76.0
City: Legislation	Herculaneum, MO	Ordinance No. 33-2010	2010	3,468	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	74.4
City: Legislation	Rancho Cucamonga, CA	Ordinance No. 857	2012	165,269	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	74.0
City: Legislation	Berwyn, IL	Ordinance No. 11-40	2011	56,657	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	73.2
City: Legislation	Meridian Charter Township, MI	Ordinance 2012-06	2012	39,688	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	72.0
City: Legislation	New Orleans, LA	Ordinance No. 24706	2011	343,829	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	70.8
City: Legislation	Concord, NC	Ordinance No. 12-89	2012	79,066	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	66.4
City: Legislation	Somerville, MA	Chapter 12, Article VII	2014	75,754	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.2													

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Legislation	Lansing Township, MI	Ordinance Bill No. 45-08 (Amending Municipal Code Section 410.020)	2011	8,126	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	58.0
City: Legislation	DeSoto, MO	Ordinance S-41094 & Ordinance G-5937	2008	6,400	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.2
City: Legislation	Airway Heights, WA	Ordinance C-720	2010	6,114	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	55.2
City: Legislation	Renton, WA	Ordinance No. 5517	2009	90,927	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	54.8
City: Legislation	Phoenix, AZ	Ordinance S-41094 & Ordinance G-5937	2014	1,445,632	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	54.0
City: Legislation	Rochester, NY	Ordinance No. 798-11	2011	210,565	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	53.6
City: Legislation	Cleveland, OH	Ordinance No. 798-11	2011	396,815	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	53.2
City: Legislation	Ypsilanti, MI	Ordinance No. 122386	2011	19,435	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	52.8
City: Legislation	Seattle, WA	Bill Amending Article 1 of Chapter 40 of the Municipal Code	2007	608,660	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.8
City: Legislation	Ferguson, MO	Ordinance No. 627	2008	1,677	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.0
City: Legislation	Point Pleasant, NJ	Ordinance No. 2010-05	2011	18,392	3	3.60	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	52.0
City: Legislation	Dexter, MI	Ordinance No. 586	2010	4,067	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	Gladstone, MI	Ordinance No. 490	2012	4,973	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	Houghton, MI	Ordinance No. 731	2010	7,708	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	Ironwood, MI	Ordinance No. 627	2011	5,387	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	Saline, MI	Ordinance No. 627	2010	8,810	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	St. Ignace, MI	Ordinance No. 627	2011	2,452	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	Taylor, MI	Ordinance No. 627	2010	63,131	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.6
City: Legislation	North Myrtle Beach, SC	Ordinance No. 627	2009	13,752	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	50.4
City: Legislation	Cairo, WV	Ordinance No. 627	2011	281	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	50.0
City: Legislation	Elizabeth, WV	Ordinance No. 627	2011	823	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	50.0
City: Legislation	Ellenboro, WV	Ordinance No. 627	2011	363	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	50.0
City: Legislation	St. Louis, MO	Board Bill No. 7	2010	319,294	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	49.6
City: Legislation	Buffalo, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2008	261,310	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	49.2
City: Legislation	Milledgeville, GA	Ordinance No. C-1305-007	2013	29,808	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	48.8
City: Legislation	Raceland, KY	Ordinance 2012-3	2012	2,424	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	48.8
City: Legislation	Williamston, MI	Ordinance No. 325	2011	3,854	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	47.6
City: Legislation	Lathrup Village, MI	Ordinance No. 421-11	2011	4,075	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.8
City: Legislation	Alpena, MI	Ordinance 11-414	2011	10,483	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.4
City: Legislation	Ferdale, MI	Ordinance No. 1101	2010	19,900	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.4
City: Legislation	Philadelphia, PA*	Bill No. 12053201	2012	1,526,006	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	46.4
City: Legislation	Woodstock, IL	Ordinance No. 14-0-40	2014	24,770	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	44.4
City: Legislation	Columbia, MO	Ordinance 018097	2004	108,500	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	44.0
City: Legislation	Salt Lake City, UT	Ordinance No. 4-10	2010	186,440	5	6.00	1	4.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	44.0
City: Legislation	Conway, SC	Unified Development Ordinance, Article 7 – Streets and Circulation	2011	17,103	5	6.00	3	12.00	0	0.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	43.2
City: Legislation	Pittsfield Township, MI	Ordinance No. 294	2011	34,663	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	41.6
City: Legislation	Oakland, CA	Ordinance No. 13153	2013	390,724	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	40.4
City: Legislation	Albany, NY	Ordinance No. 2013-03-913	2013	594,962	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	40.4
City: Legislation	White Salmon, WA	Ordinance No. 2013-03-913	2013	2,224	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.2
City: Legislation	Jamestown, NY	Ordinance No. 2013-03-913	2012	31,146	1	1.20	1	4.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	38.0
City: Legislation	San Francisco, CA	Public Works Code 2.4.13 (Ordinance No. 209-05)	2008	805,235	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	37.2
City: Legislation	Bellevue, NE	Ordinance No. 3068	2011	50,137	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	36.4
City: Legislation	Bremerton, WA	Ordinance No. 3068	2012	37,729	5	6.00	3	12.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	34.8
City: Legislation	Hattiesburg, MS	Ordinance No. 3068	2012	16,087	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.4
City: Legislation	Mountlake Terrace, WA	Mountlake Terrace Municipal Code 19.95.939(E)	2012	19,909	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	33.2
City: Legislation	Conway, AR	Ordinance No. 0-09-56	2009	58,905	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	32.4
City: Legislation	Dunkirk, NY	Local Law #2-2014	2014	12,563	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.6
City: Legislation	Lansing, MI	Ordinance No. 1145	2009	114,297	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	30.4
City: Legislation	Hopewell Township (Mercer), NJ	Revised General Ordinances Ch. XV Sec. 6	2014	17,304	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.0
City: Legislation	Burien, WA	Ordinance No. 599	2011	33,313	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.4
City: Legislation	Redmond, WA	Redmond Municipal Code Chapter 12.06: Complete the Streets	2007	54,144	3	3.60	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.0
City: Legislation	Honolulu, HI	Revised Charter of Honolulu Sections 6-1703, 6-1706	2006	337,256	3	3.60	1	4.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	23.6
City: Legislation	Issaquah, WA	Issaquah Municipal Code Chapter 12.10: Complete Streets (Ordinance No. 2514)	2007	30,434	3	3.60	0	0.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	23.6
City: Legislation	Edmonds, WA	Ordinance No. 3842	2011	39,709	5	6.00	2	8.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00											



Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Legislation	Warrensburg, NY	Subdivision Regulations, Sec 178-20	2013	4,094	1	1.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9.6
City: Resolution																									
City: Resolution	Lakemoor, IL	Resolution No. 14-R-11	2014	6,017	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	88.8
City: Resolution	Northfield, MN	Resolution 2012-017	2012	20,007	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	83.2
City: Resolution	Suisun City, CA	Resolution	2012	28,111	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	80.8
City: Resolution	Birmingham, AL	Resolution	2011	212,237	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	79.2
City: Resolution	Trenton, NJ	Resolution No. 12-121	2012	84,913	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	78.4
City: Resolution	Bellevue, NE	Resolution	2011	50,137	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	78.0
City: Resolution	Montevallo, AL	Resolution 04222013-400	2013	6,823	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	76.0
City: Resolution	Belgrade, MT	Resolution No. 2014-17	2014	7,389	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	75.6
City: Resolution	Missoula, MT	Resolution No. 7473, Providing for a Complete Streets Policy	2009	66,788	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	75.6
City: Resolution	Battle Lake, MN	Resolution No. 06-14-2011	2011	875	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	74.4
City: Resolution	Pipestone, MN	Resolution	2011	4,317	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	74.4
City: Resolution	St. Cloud, MN	Resolution 2011-11-164	2011	65,842	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	74.4
City: Resolution	Camden, NJ	Resolution	2013	77,344	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	74.4
City: Resolution	Linden, NJ	Resolution 2013-375	2013	40,499	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	74.4
City: Resolution	Caldwell, NJ	Resolution 4-100	2014	7,822	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	73.6
City: Resolution	Fanwood, Borough of, NJ	Resolution 14-03-63	2014	7,318	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	72.4
City: Resolution	Dobbs Ferry, NY	Resolution No. 14-2012	2012	10,875	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	71.2
City: Resolution	Onalaska, WI	Resolution No. 25-2012	2012	17,736	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	71.2
City: Resolution	Maynard, MA	Complete Streets Resolution	2013	10,106	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	71.2
City: Resolution	Lemont, IL	Resolution	2011	16,000	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	70.4
City: Resolution	Bozeman, MT	Resolution No. 4244	2010	37,280	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	70.4
City: Resolution	Chatham Borough, NJ	Resolution No. 12-195	2012	8,962	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	70.4
City: Resolution	Everett, MA	Resolution	2014	41,667	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	69.6
City: Resolution	Breckenridge, MN	Resolution No. 12092-42/2011	2011	3,386	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	69.6
City: Resolution	Winter Park, FL	Resolution No 2083-11	2011	27,852	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	69.2
City: Resolution	Red Wing, MN	Resolution No. 6196	2011	16,459	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	69.2
City: Resolution	Rye, City of, NY	Resolution	2013	15,720	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	68.0
City: Resolution	Black Mountain, NC	Resolution R-14-02	2014	7,848	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	67.2
City: Resolution	Byron, MN	Resolution	2010	4,914	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.4
City: Resolution	Ottertail (city), MN	Resolution 2013-02	2013	572	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.4
City: Resolution	Parkers Prairie (city), MN	Resolution 13-06	2013	1,011	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.4
City: Resolution	Stewartville, MN	Resolution 2010-32	2010	5,916	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.4
City: Resolution	Worthington, MN	Resolution Establishing a Complete Streets Policy	2013	12,764	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.4
City: Resolution	Bonita Springs, FL	Resolution	2014	43,914	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	65.6
City: Resolution	Hoffman Estates, IL	Resolution	2011	51,895	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.4
City: Resolution	Grandview, MO	Resolution 2011-24	2011	24,475	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.4
City: Resolution	University City, MO	Resolution 2014-42	2014	35,371	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	63.2
City: Resolution	Kansas City, KS	Resolution No. 22-11	2011	145,786	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	62.8
City: Resolution	Fergus Falls, MN	Resolution No. 14-2012	2012	13,138	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	62.4
City: Resolution	Frazee, MN	Resolution 0813-12A	2012	1,350	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	62.4
City: Resolution	Blue Springs, MO	Resolution	2011	52,575	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	62.0
City: Resolution	Cranford Township, NJ	Resolution 2013-293	2013	22,625	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	60.0
City: Resolution	Netcong, NJ	Resolution 2010-96	2010	3,232	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	60.0
City: Resolution	Cape May, NJ	Resolution No. 189-08-2012	2012	3,607	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	58.8
City: Resolution	Baltimore, MD	Council Bill 09-0433	2010	620,961	5	6.00	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	58.0
City: Resolution	Downe Township, NJ	Resolution R-97-2013	2013	1,585	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	58.0
City: Resolution	Forest Park, IL	Resolution	2011	14,167	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	57.2
City: Resolution	West Jefferson, NC	Resolution	2011	1,293	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	57.2
City: Resolution	Dilworth, MN	Resolution 11-09	2011	4,024	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	56.8
City: Resolution	Riverdale, IL	Resolution	2012	13,549	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	56.4
City: Resolution	Williamstown, KY	Municipal Order No. 2013-13	2013	3,925	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	56.0
City: Resolution	Helena, MT	Resolution No. 19799	2010	28,190	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	54.4
City: Resolution	West Salem, WI	Resolution No. 2.11	2011	4,799	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	0	0.00	5								

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Resolution	Fair Haven, NJ	Resolution No. 2012-140	2012	6,121	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	48.8
City: Resolution	Raritan, Township of, NJ	Resolution 13-30	2013	22,185	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	48.8
City: Resolution	Mesilla, NM	Resolution 2008-25	2008	2,196	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	48.4
City: Resolution	Orange City, FL	Resolution 643-11	2011	10,599	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	47.6
City: Resolution	Middle Township, NJ	Resolution 509-12	2012	18,911	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	47.6
City: Resolution	Wildwood, NJ	Resolution	2013	5,325	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	47.6
City: Resolution	Overland Park, KS	Resolution No. 3919	2012	173,372	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	47.6
City: Resolution	Seacaucus, NJ	Complete Streets Policy	2013	16,264	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	47.2
City: Resolution	Titusville, FL	Resolution No. 15-2011	2011	43,761	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Columbus, MS	Resolution	2010	23,640	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Hernando, MS	Resolution	2010	14,090	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Pascagoula, MS	Resolution	2010	22,392	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Tupelo, MS	Resolution	2010	34,546	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.8
City: Resolution	New Haven, CT	Complete Streets Order	2008	129,585	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Collinsville, OK	Resolution	2012	5,606	3	3.60	4	16.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Sand Springs, OK	Resolution	2012	18,906	3	3.60	4	16.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	46.8
City: Resolution	Cape Canaveral, FL	Resolution No. 2011-09	2011	9,912	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.4
City: Resolution	Shelby, MT	Resolution 1877	2014	3,376	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.0
City: Resolution	Sidney, MT	Resolution No. 3650	2014	5,191	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.0
City: Resolution	Millford Township, MI	Resolution	2011	9,561	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.0
City: Resolution	Freehold Borough, NJ	Resolution	2012	12,052	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	46.0
City: Resolution	Newark, NJ	Resolution	2012	277,140	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	45.6
City: Resolution	Ocean City, NJ	Resolution	2011	11,701	3	3.60	3	12.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	44.8
City: Resolution	Rockledge, FL	Resolution	2011	24,926	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	44.4
City: Resolution	Hammonton, NJ	Resolution 138-2013	2013	14,791	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	44.4
City: Resolution	Garfield, NJ	Resolution 14-330	2014	30,487	5	6.00	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	44.4
City: Resolution	Lambertville, NJ	Resolution 91-2012	2012	3,906	3	3.60	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	44.0
City: Resolution	New Hope, MN	Resolution	2011	20,339	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	43.2
City: Resolution	Elisberry, MO	Resolution 2010-002	2010	1,934	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	42.4
City: Resolution	Orange Beach, AL	Resolution No. 10-097	2010	5,441	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	42.0
City: Resolution	New Providence, NJ	Resolution	2013	12,171	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	42.0
City: Resolution	Tenafly, NJ	Resolution R14-143	2014	14,488	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	42.0
City: Resolution	Johnsburg, NY	Resolution No. 124	2012	2,370	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	41.6
City: Resolution	Lake Luzerne, NY	Resolution No. 48 of 2012	2012	1,227	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	41.6
City: Resolution	Allen Park, MI	Resolution 10-1214-294	2010	28,210	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	41.2
City: Resolution	Atlas Township, MI	Resolution No. 11-02	2011	7,993	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	41.2
City: Resolution	Gibraltar, MI	Resolution No. 011-001	2011	4,656	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	41.2
City: Resolution	Independence, MO	Resolution 5672	2011	116,830	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	41.2
City: Resolution	Bethlehem, NY	Resolution No. 30	2009	33,656	3	3.60	1	4.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	41.2
City: Resolution	Midfield, AL	Resolution No 2012-2	2012	5,365	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	40.8
City: Resolution	Mantua Township, NJ	Resolution R-167-2012	2012	15,217	5	6.00	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	40.4
City: Resolution	Kingston, NY	Resolution	2010	23,893	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	40.4
City: Resolution	Grantsville, WV	Resolution Providing for Complete Streets	2011	561	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	40.4
City: Resolution	Angelica, NY	Resolution	2012	869	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Brookhaven, NY	Resolution 2010-993	2010	3,451	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Cuba, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	1,575	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Gowanda, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	2,709	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Islip, NY	Resolution	2010	18,689	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Charlottesville, VA	Resolution	2010	43,475	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Ewing Township, NJ	Resolution 14R-170	2014	35,790	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Fort Edward, NY	Resolution No. 26 of 2012	2012	6,371	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Lake George, NY	Resolution No. 208	2012	906	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Malone, NY	Resolution No. 73-2012	2012	14,545	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Village of Fort Edward, NY	Resolution No. 45	2012	3,375	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Resolution	Greenwood, MS	Resolution	2012	16,087	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.2
City: Resolution	Upper Arlington, OH	Complete Streets Policy	2014	33,771	5	6.00</																			

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Resolution	West Windsor, NJ	Resolution 2010-R175	2010	27,165	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	35.2
City: Resolution	East Windsor, NJ	Resolution R2014-086	2014	27,190	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.8
City: Resolution	Knoxville, TN	Resolution No. 287-09	2009	178,874	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	34.8
City: Resolution	Jackson, MI	Resolution	2006	33,534	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
City: Resolution	Hoboken, NJ	Resolution	2010	50,005	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
City: Resolution	Montvale, NJ	Resolution No. 44-2013	2013	7,844	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
City: Resolution	Roselle, NJ	Resolution 2013-232	2013	21,085	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	34.0
City: Resolution	Clarkston, GA	Resolution	2011	7,554	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	33.2
City: Resolution	Maplewood, NJ	Resolution 51-12	2012	23,867	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	33.2
City: Resolution	Troy, NY	Resolution No. 4	2013	50,129	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	33.2
City: Resolution	Lancaster, PA	Resolution	2014	59,322	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	33.2
City: Resolution	Everett, WA	Resolution	2008	103,019	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	33.2
City: Resolution	St. Paul, MN	Resolution No. 09-213	2009	285,068	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	32.4
City: Resolution	Union City, NJ	Resolution Establishing a Complete Streets Policy	2013	66,455	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	32.4
City: Resolution	Lewis, NY	Resolution	2011	854	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	32.4
City: Resolution	Newport, RI	Resolution No. 2010-130	2010	24,672	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	32.4
City: Resolution	Chickasaw, AL	Complete Streets Resolution	2009	6,106	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.6
City: Resolution	Dubuque, IA	Resolution No. 124-11	2011	57,637	3	3.60	4	16.00	0	0.00	3	9.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.6
City: Resolution	Randolph Township, NJ	Resolution No. 157-12	2012	25,734	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.6
City: Resolution	South Brunswick, NJ	Resolution 2014-189	2014	43,417	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.6
City: Resolution	West Orange Township, NJ	Resolution 13-02	2013	46,207	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	31.2
City: Resolution	Somers Point, NJ	Resolution No. 171 of 2012	2012	10,795	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.8
City: Resolution	Far Hills, NJ	Resolution No. 14-139	2014	919	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.4
City: Resolution	Robbinsville, NJ	Resolution 2014-145	2014	13,642	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.4
City: Resolution	Montgomery Township, NJ	Resolution	2012	22,258	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.0
City: Resolution	Prattville, AL	Resolution	2010	33,960	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Golden, CO	Resolution No. 2059	2010	18,867	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Long Lake Township, MI	Resolution	2013	8,662	1	1.20	4	16.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Traverse City, MI	Resolution	2011	14,674	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Senatobia, MS	Resolution	2012	8,165	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Raritan, Borough of, NJ	Resolution	2011	6,881	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Ilion, NY	Resolution	2011	8,053	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Columbus, OH	Resolution	2008	787,033	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Edmond, OK	Resolution No. 11-10	2010	81,405	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Austin, TX	Resolution No. 020418-40	2002	790,390	5	6.00	0	0.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Morgantown, WV	Resolution	2007	29,660	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29.2
City: Resolution	Mobile, AL	Resolution	2011	195,111	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.4
City: Resolution	Macon, GA	Resolution	2012	91,351	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.4
City: Resolution	Duluth, MN	Resolution No. 10-0218	2010	86,265	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	28.4
City: Resolution	Keene, NH	R-2011-28	2011	23,409	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	28.4
City: Resolution	Rutherford, Borough of, NJ	Resolution	2011	18,061	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.4
City: Resolution	Newport, OR	Resolution No. 3508	2010	9,989	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	28.4
City: Resolution	Montclair, NJ	Resolution No. 233-09	2009	37,669	3	3.60	3	12.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.0
City: Resolution	Iowa City, IA	Resolution Adopting a Complete Streets Policy for the City of Iowa City, IA and Repealing Resolution No. 07-109	2007	67,862	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Guthrie, OK	Resolution 2011-02	2011	10,191	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Columbia, SC	Resolution No. R2010-054	2010	129,272	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Greenville, SC	Resolution 2008-49	2008	58,409	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Greenwood, SC	Resolution	2012	23,222	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Long Hill Township, NJ	Resolution 12-205	2012	8,702	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Westfield, NJ	Resolution 314 of 2013	2013	30,316	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.6
City: Resolution	Hempstead, NY	Resolution	2012	53,891	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	26.8
City: Resolution	Newark, NJ	Resolution 11-3A	2011	47,573	1	1.20	0	0.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	26.0
City: Resolution	Vineland, NJ	Resolution	2011	60,724	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	25.6
City: Resolution	Portland, ME	Resolution	2011	66,194	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	25.2
City: Resolution	Perth Amboy, NJ	R-575-12/13	2013	50,814	1	1.20	3	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	25.2
City: Resolution	Kingsport, TN	Resolution	2011	48,205	1	1.20																			

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Resolution	Medford, NJ	Resolution 132-2012	2012	23,033	3	3.60	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22.0
City: Resolution	Northvale, NJ	Resolution 2013-17	2013	4,640	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22.0
City: Resolution	Golden Valley, MN	Resolution 11-8	2011	20,371	3	3.60	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.6
City: Resolution	Novato, CA	Resolution	2007	51,904	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Columbus, GA	Resolution 92-14	2014	189,885	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Alleghen, MI	Resolution 10-42	2010	4,998	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Alma, MI	Resolution	2013	9,383	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Berkley, MI	Resolution 48-10	2010	14,970	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Berrien Springs, MI	Resolution	2011	1,800	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Birmingham, MI	Resolution	2011	20,103	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Manistique, MI	Resolution	2010	3,097	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Novi, MI	Resolution	2010	55,224	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Owosso, MI	Resolution	2011	15,194	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Suttons Bay, MI	Resolution Supporting the Michigan Department of Transportation Complete Streets Initiative as Outlined in Public Act 134, and Public Act 135, of 2010	2011	618	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Wayland, MI	Resolution No. 2011-10	2011	4,079	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Madison, Borough of, NJ	Resolution 161-2012	2012	15,845	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Pawtucket, RI	Resolution	2011	71,148	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Providence, RI	Resolution	2012	178,042	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Spokane, WA	Resolution No. 2010-0018	2010	208,916	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Belmont, WV	Resolution Providing for Complete Streets	2011	903	1	1.20	3	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	21.2
City: Resolution	Buena Borough, NJ	Resolution No. 148-14	2014	4,603	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	20.8
City: Resolution	Fairfax, CA	Resolution No. 2527	2008	7,441	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
City: Resolution	Ross, CA	Resolution No. 1718	2010	2,415	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
City: Resolution	San Anselmo, CA	Bicycle Master Plan Appendix B: Complete Streets Resolution	2008	12,336	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
City: Resolution	Holland, MI	Resolution	2011	33,051	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
City: Resolution	Ninety-Six, SC	Resolution	2012	1,998	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.4
City: Resolution	Hopatcong, NJ	Resolution 2012-151	2012	15,147	3	3.60	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Bergenfield, Borough of, NJ	Resolution 13-278	2013	26,764	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Frenchtown, NJ	Resolution 2011-36	2011	1,373	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Glen Ridge, NJ	Resolution No. 132-12	2012	7,527	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Hackensack, NJ	Resolution No. 226-12	2012	43,010	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Maywood, NJ	Resolution	2011	9,555	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	North Wildwood, NJ	Resolution	2012	4,041	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Woodbine, NJ	Resolution 12-112-2012	2012	2,472	1	1.20	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.6
City: Resolution	Flint, MI	Resolution No. _____	2009	102,434	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.2
City: Resolution	Hightstown, NJ	Resolution 2014-129	2014	5,494	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.2
City: Resolution	Hopewell, NJ	Resolution No. 2012-38	2012	1,922	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.2
City: Resolution	Pennington, Borough of, NJ	Resolution 2014 - 6.10	2014	2,585	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	19.2
City: Resolution	Valley Stream, NY	Resolution 151-13	2013	37,511	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	18.8
City: Resolution	Acme Township, MI	Resolution	2011	4,375	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Burt Township, MI	Resolution	2011	522	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Escanaba, MI	Resolution	2011	12,616	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Fremont, MI	Resolution R-11-08	2011	4,081	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Hamburg Township, MI	Resolution	2011	21,165	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Hamtramck, MI	Resolution 2010-120	2010	22,423	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Kinross Township, MI	Resolution 2011-11	2011	7,561	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Lake Isabella, MI	Resolution	2011	1,681	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Linden, MI	Resolution	2010	3,991	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Ludington, MI	Resolution	2011	8,076	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Mackinaw City, MI	Resolution	2010	806	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Marquette Township, MI	Resolution	2011	603	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Munising, MI	Resolution	2011	2,355	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Newberry, MI	Resolution	2011	1,519	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Otsego, MI	Resolution No. 2011-18	2011	3,956	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Oxford, MI	Resolution	2011	3,436	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17.2
City: Resolution	Pellston, MI	Resolution	2011	822	1	1.20	4	16.																	

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Resolution	New Milford, NJ	Resolution 2014:152	2014	16,341	1	1.20	0	0.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	13.2
City: Resolution	Grand Rapids, MI	Resolution	2011	188,040	1	1.20	1	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	9.2
City: Resolution	Spartanburg, SC	Resolution	2006	37,013	1	1.20	0	0.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6.0
City: Resolution	Manitowoc, WI	Resolution NO. 084	2012	33,736	3	3.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5.6
City: Tax levy																									
City: Tax levy	Seattle, WA	Bridging the Gap	2006	608,660	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	56.8
City: Executive order																									
City: Executive order	Memphis, TN	An Order Establishing a Complete Streets Policy for the City of Memphis	2013	646,889	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	57.6
City: Executive order	Houston, TX	Executive Order No. 1-15	2013	2,099,451	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	51.6
City: Executive order	Nashville, TN	Executive Order No. 40	2010	601,222	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	50.0
City: Executive order	Lincoln, NE	Executive Order 086476	2013	258,379	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	43.6
City: Executive order	Salt Lake City, UT	Executive Order on Complete Streets	2007	186,440	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	35.6
City: Executive order	Philadelphia, PA	Executive Order No. 5-09	2009	1,526,006	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	33.2
City: Internal policy																									
City: Internal policy	Dover, NH	Complete Streets and Traffic Calming Guidelines	2014	29,987	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	77.2
City: Internal policy	Virginia Beach, VA	Complete Streets Administrative Directive	2014	437,994	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	62.4
City: Internal policy	North Chicago, IL	Access Unlimited: A Compact Complete Streets Policy Guide	2014	32,374	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	58.4
City: Internal policy	New Brunswick, NJ	Complete Streets Policy	2012	55,181	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	57.6
City: Internal policy	Denver, CO	Complete Streets Policy	2011	600,158	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.4
City: Internal policy	Chicago, IL	Safe Streets for Chicago	2006	2,695,598	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.6
City: Internal policy	Midland, MI	Complete Streets Policy	2010	41,863	3	3.60	1	4.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.4
City: Policy Adopted by an Elected Board																									
City: Policy	Peru, IN	Ordinance 31, 2013	2013	11,417	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	92.8
City: Policy	Littletton, MA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	8,924	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	90.4
City: Policy	Baldwin Park, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	75,390	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	88.8
City: Policy	Hermosa Beach, CA	Living Streets Policy	2012	19,596	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	88.8
City: Policy	Huntington Park, CA	Resolution No. 2012-18	2012	58,114	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	88.8
City: Policy	Auburn, ME	Complete Streets Policy	2013	23,055	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	88.0
City: Policy	Lewiston, ME	Complete Streets Policy	2013	36,592	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	86.0
City: Policy	Acton, MA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	21,929	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	87.2
City: Policy	Middleton, MA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	8,987	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	87.2
City: Policy	Reading, MA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	24,747	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	87.2
City: Policy	Salem, MA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	41,340	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	87.2
City: Policy	Stoughton, MA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	26,962	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	86.4
City: Policy	Fort Lauderdale, FL	Complete Streets Policy	2013	165,521	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	85.6
City: Policy	Pleasanton, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	70,285	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	84.0
City: Policy	Portland, ME	Complete Streets Policy	2012	66,194	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	84.0
City: Policy	New Hope, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	20,339	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	84.0
City: Policy	Piqua, OH	Complete Streets Policy	2013	20,522	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	82.4
City: Policy	Richmond, VA	Resolution No. 2014-R172-170	2014	204,214	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	82.4
City: Policy	Portsmouth, NH	Policy 2013-01	2013	21,233	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	82.0
City: Policy	Oakland, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	390,724	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	81.6
City: Policy	Elizabethtown, PA	Resolution No. 2014-12	2014	11,545	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	81.6
City: Policy	Hayward, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	144,186	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	80.8
City: Policy	Livermore, CA	Resolution 2013-007	2013	80,968	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	80.8
City: Policy	Cedar Falls, IA	Resolution 18,703	2013	39,260	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	80.0
City: Policy	Waterloo, IA	Resolution 2013-474	2013	68,406	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	80.0
City: Policy	Berkeley, CA	Resolution 65,978-N-S.	2012	112,580	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	79.2
City: Policy	Muscataine, IA	Resolution 92610-1113	2013	22,886	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	79.2
City: Policy	Brooklyn Center, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2013	30,104	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	78.4
City: Policy	Hopkins, MN	Legislative Policy 8-1	2013	17,591	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	77.6
City: Policy	Baton Rouge, LA	Resolution No 51196	2014	229,423	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.6
City: Policy	Azusa, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	43,361	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	76.8
City: Policy	Roanoke, VA	Complete Streets Policy	2008	97,032	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	76.8
City: Policy	Emeryville, CA	Resolution No. 13-03	2013	10,080	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	76.0
City: Policy	Big Lake, MN	Resolution No. 2010-74	2010	10,060	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	76.0
City: Policy	American Canyon, CA	Resolution 2012-72	2012	19,454	5	6.00	5	20.00	5																

Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Policy	Redding, CA	Council Policy No. 1303	2012	89,861	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	70.0
City: Policy	Piedmont, CA	Resolution No. 106-12	2012	10,667	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	69.6
City: Policy	Alameda, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	73,812	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	69.6
City: Policy	Arlington Heights, IL	Complete Streets Policy	2013	75,101	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	69.6
City: Policy	Springfield, MO	Complete Streets Policy	2014	159,498	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	68.8
City: Policy	Athens-Clarke County, GA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	115,425	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	68.8
City: Policy	Algonquin, IL	Resolution No. 2014-R-28	2014	30,046	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	68.8
City: Policy	Zeeland, MI	Complete Streets Policy	2013	5,504	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	68.4
City: Policy	Pleasant Hill, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	33,152	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	68.0
City: Policy	Charlottesville, VA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	43,475	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	68.0
City: Policy	Silver Creek, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2014	2,656	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	66.4
City: Policy	Summit, NJ	Complete Streets Policy	2014	21,457	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	66.0
City: Policy	Cherry Hill Township, NJ	Resolution 2013-03-09	2014	71,045	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	65.6
City: Policy	Great Neck Plaza, NY	Complete Streets Policy Guide	2012	6,707	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	64.8
City: Policy	Riverside, OH	Resolution No. 14-R-1918	2014	25,201	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.8
City: Policy	Albany, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	18,536	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.0
City: Policy	San Leandro, CA	Resolution 2013-018	2013	84,950	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.0
City: Policy	Union City, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	69,516	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	64.0
City: Policy	Saratoga Springs, NY	Complete Streets Policy	2012	26,586	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	64.0
City: Policy	Woodbridge, NJ	Resolution	2011	99,585	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	63.2
City: Policy	Las Cruces, NM	Resolution 09-301	2009	97,618	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	62.4
City: Policy	Grant-Valkaria, FL	Resolution No. 07-2011	2011	3,850	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	61.6
City: Policy	Los Altos Hills, CA	Complete Streets Policy (Resolution 8-13)	2013	7,922	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	60.8
City: Policy	Chicago Heights, IL	Resolution No. 2013-43	2013	30,276	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	60.8
City: Policy	Ojai, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	7,461	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	60.8
City: Policy	Evanston, IL	Resolution 6-R-14	2014	74,486	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	60.8
City: Policy	Tinley Park, IL	Complete Streets Policy	2012	56,703	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	60.8
City: Policy	Lawrence, KS	Complete Streets Policy	2012	87,643	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	60.8
City: Policy	Roswell, GA	Resolution 2009-03-10	2009	88,346	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	58.4
City: Policy	Vacaville, CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	92,428	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	57.6
City: Policy	Windham, ME	Complete Streets Policy	2014	17,001	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	56.8
City: Policy	Rockville, MD	Complete Streets Policy	2009	61,209	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	3	9.60	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	56.8
City: Policy	Lewisboro, NY	Policy	2011	12,411	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	56.8
City: Policy	Falcon Heights, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	5,321	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	56.0
City: Policy	Swansee, GA	Ordinance No. 2009-005	2009	15,355	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	55.2
City: Policy	East Orange, NJ	Resolution 1199	2013	64,270	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	55.2
City: Policy	Ishpeming, MI	Resolution 2011-01	2011	6,470	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	54.8
City: Policy	Sandpoint, ID	Resolution	2010	7,365	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	54.4
City: Policy	Morristown, NJ	Complete Streets Policy	2012	18,411	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	53.6
City: Policy	Dunwoody, GA	Complete Streets Policy	2011	46,267	3	3.60	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.8
City: Policy	Billings, MT	Resolution	2011	104,170	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	52.4
City: Policy	Oak Lawn, IL	Resolution No. 14-13-25	2014	56,690	3	3.60	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	52.0
City: Policy	Independence, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2011	3,504	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	52.0
City: Policy	Asheville, NC	Complete Streets Policy	2012	83,393	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	51.6
City: Policy	Coeur d'Alene, ID	Resolution 09-021	2009	44,137	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	51.2
City: Policy	Liberty Township, OH	Complete Streets Policy	2014	21,982	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	51.2
City: Policy	South Orange, NJ	Resolution 2012-224	2012	16,198	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	49.6
City: Policy	Maple Plain, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2013	1,768	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	48.8
City: Policy	Elizabeth, NJ	Resolution of the Municipal Council of the City of Elizabeth to Establish a Complete Streets Policy	2014	124,969	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	48.8
City: Policy	Whitestown, IN	Complete Streets Policy	2014	2,867	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	48.0
City: Policy	Austin, MN	Complete Streets Policy	2012	24,718	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	47.2
City: Policy	Hamilton, MT	Resolution No. 1256	2014	4,348	5	6.00	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	46.0
City: Policy	Auburndale, FL	Complete Streets Policy	2012	13,507	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	45.6
City: Policy	Bartow, FL	Complete Streets Policy	2012	17,298	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	45.6
City: Policy	Davenport, FL	Complete Streets Policy	2012	2,888	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	45.6
City: Policy	Dundee, FL	Complete Streets Policy</																							



Category	Agency	Policy	Year	Population	Intent		All users and modes		All projects and phases		Exceptions		Network		Jurisdiction		Design flexibility		Context sensitivity		Performance measures		Implementation steps		TOTAL SCORE
					Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	Points	Weighted score	
City: Policy	North Little Rock, AR	Resolution No. 74-25	2009	62,304	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>38.8</b>
City: Policy	Palm Bay, FL	Resolution No. 2011-22	2011	103,190	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>38.0</b>
City: Policy	Linwood, NJ	Resolution No. 42	2011	7,092	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>36.4</b>
City: Policy	Cascade, IA	City of Cascade Policy Statement	2006	2,159	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>35.6</b>
City: Policy	Maplewood, MN	Living Streets Policy	2013	38,018	1	1.20	0	0.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	<b>27.6</b>
City: Policy	Concord, NH	Comprehensive Transportation Policy	2010	42,695	5	6.00	1	4.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>27.2</b>



**Smart Growth America**  
Making Neighborhoods Great Together



**National Complete  
Streets Coalition**

**The National Complete Streets Coalition**, a program of Smart Growth America, is a non-profit, non-partisan alliance of public interest organizations and transportation professionals committed to the development and implementation of Complete Streets policies and practices. A nationwide movement launched by the Coalition in 2004, Complete Streets is the integration of people and place in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation networks. To date, over 700 agencies have adopted Complete Streets policies.

**Smart Growth America** is the only national organization dedicated to researching, advocating for, and leading coalitions to bring better development to more communities nationwide. From providing more sidewalks to ensuring more homes are built near public transportation or that productive farms remain a part of our communities, smart growth helps make sure people across the nation can live in great neighborhoods.

For additional information, visit [www.smartgrowthamerica.org/completestreets](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/completestreets).

Smart Growth America | 1707 L St. NW Suite 250 | Washington, DC 20036