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Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**A RESOLUTION OF THE [*City Council/Board of Supervisors*] OF THE [*Jurisdiction*] ADOPTING A COMPLETE STREETS POLICY**

**WHEREAS**, safe, convenient, and accessible transportation for all users is a priority of [*Jurisdiction*];

**WHEREAS,** the term “Complete Streets” describes a comprehensive, integrated transportation network with infrastructure and design that allow safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, seniors, children, youth, and families;

**WHEREAS,** the lack of Complete Streets is dangerous for pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transportation riders,1–3 particularly children,4,5,6 older adults,7 and persons with disabilities8,9; on average, a pedestrian was killed every two hours and injured every seven minutes in traffic crashes in 201210;

**WHEREAS,** [*add local data on traffic injuries if desired and available*];

**WHEREAS**, low- and moderate-income areas, whether they be located in rural, urban,   
or suburban communities, are typically the least safe for pedestrians and bicyclists,11 especially for children walking and biking to school,12 due to long-standing infrastructure disparities13–15 and a higher concentration of streets with faster-moving and/or higher-volume traffic16,17;

**WHEREAS,** Complete Streets improve public health and safety by reducing the risk of injuries and fatalities from traffic collisions for users of all modes of transportation1,2,18–24;

**WHEREAS,** streets that are designed with the safety and convenience of pedestrians and bicyclists in mind increase the number of people walking and bicycling25–27;

**WHEREAS,** a balanced transportation system that includes Complete Streets is conducive to streets that are lively with people walking and bicycling to everyday destinations, such as schools, shops, restaurants, businesses, parks, transit, and jobs, which in turn enhances neighborhood economic vitality20,22,28–32 and livability33–35;

**WHEREAS**, encouraging people to walk, bicycle, and use public transit saves energy resources, reduces air pollution, and reduces emissions of global warming gases36–38;

**WHEREAS,** [*add local data on obesity, chronic disease, etc., if desired and available*];

**WHEREAS,** Complete Streets encourage an active lifestyle by creating opportunities to integrate exercise into daily activities,39,40 thereby helping to reduce the risk of obesity and its associated health problems, which include diabetes, heart disease, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, as well as certain cancers, stroke, asthma, and depression41–45; and

**WHEREAS**, in light of the foregoing benefits and considerations, [*Jurisdiction*] wishes to improve its commitment to Complete Streets and desires that its streets form a comprehensive and integrated transportation network promoting safe, equitable, and convenient travel for all users while preserving flexibility, recognizing community context, and using the latest and best design guidelines and standards.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** by the [*City Council/Board of Supervisors*] of [*Jurisdiction*], State of [­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_], as follows:

1. That the [*Jurisdiction*] adopts the Complete Streets Policy (“Policy”) attached hereto as Exhibit A, and made part of this Resolution.
2. That the next substantive revision of the [*Jurisdiction*]’s [*Comprehensive/ General/Master*] Plan [*or insert name of comparable local planning document if different*] shall incorporate Complete Streets policies and principles consistent with the Policy.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the [*City Council/Board of Supervisors*] of the [*Jurisdiction*], State of [­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_], on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_, by the following vote:

Attachment: Exhibit A

**EXHIBIT A**

This Complete Streets Policy was adopted by Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ by the [*City Council/Board of Supervisors*] of the [*Jurisdiction*] on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2­­­\_\_\_\_.

**COMPLETE STREETS POLICY OF [*JURISDICTION*]**

A. DEFINITIONS

1. “Complete Street” means a street or roadway that allows safe and convenient travel by all of the following categories of users: pedestrians, bicyclists, people with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, users and operators of public transportation, seniors, children, youth, and families [*insert other significant local users if desired, e.g., drivers of agricultural vehicles, emergency vehicles, or freight*].
2. “High Need Area” means (1) any census tract in which the median household income is less than [*80%*] of the statewide average median based on the most current census tract-level data from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, (2) any area within two miles of a school in which at least [*50%*] of the children are eligible to receive free and reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program, or (3) any area that has a high number of pedestrian and/or bicycle collisions.
3. “Transportation Project” means any development, project, program, or practice that affects the transportation network or occurs in the public right-of-way, including any construction, reconstruction, retrofit, signalization operations, resurfacing, restriping, rehabilitation, maintenance (excluding routine maintenance that does not change the roadway geometry or operations, such as mowing, sweeping, and spot repair), operations, alteration, and repair of any public street or roadway within [*Jurisdiction*] (including alleys, bridges, frontage roads, and other elements of the transportation system).

B. COMPLETE STREETS REQUIREMENTS

[*Jurisdiction*] shall work toward developing an integrated and connected multimodal transportation system of Complete Streets that serves all neighborhoods. Toward this end:

1. Every Transportation Project, and phase of that project (including planning, scoping, funding, design, approval, implementation, and maintenance), by [*Jurisdiction*] shall provide for Complete Streets for all categories of users identified in Section A(1) of this Policy.
2. The [*identify relevant internal departments and agencies by name*] shall routinely work in coordination with each other, any Bicycle or Pedestrian Coordinator, and any relevant advisory committees, to create Complete Streets and to ensure consistency with any existing Pedestrian/Bicycle/Multi-Modal Plans [*or insert name of other comparable plans*].
3. Wherever possible, Transportation Projects shall strive to create a network of continuous bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly routes, including routes that connect with transit and allow for convenient access to work, home, commercial areas, and schools.
4. The [*insert names of departments and agencies identified in Section B(2)*] shall coordinate with adjacent jurisdiction(s) and any other relevant public agencies, including [*insert relevant regional/state agencies*], to ensure that, wherever possible, the network of continuous bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly routes identified in Section B(3) extends beyond [*Jurisdiction*]’s boundaries into adjacent jurisdictions.
5. [*Jurisdiction*] shall rely upon the current editions of street design standards and guidelines that promote and support Complete Streets.

**COMMENT:** Current examples of street design standards and guidelines that promote and support Complete Streets [*add as of date when draft is finalized*]

* *Urban Street Design Guide* and *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* (National Association of City Transportation Officials)
* *Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A context sensitive approach* (Institute of Transportation Engineers/Congress for the New Urbanism)
* [*Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System*](http://www.pedbikesafe.org/PEDSAFE/countermeasures.cfm) (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration)
* *Bicycle Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System* (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration)
* *Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide* (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration)

1. This Policy shall be implemented in all neighborhoods, with particular attention to High Need Areas.
2. All Complete Streets shall reflect the context and character of the surrounding built and natural environments, and enhance the appearance of such. At the planning stage, [*Jurisdiction*] shall work with local residents, business operators, neighboring jurisdictions, school districts, students, property owners, and other stakeholders who will be directly affected by a Complete Streets project to address any concerns regarding context and character.

C. LEAD DEPARTMENT

The [*insert name of lead department or agency* (*e.g., Transportation or Planning Department*) *and title of person accountable* (*e.g., Director or Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator*)] shall lead the implementation of this Policy and coordinate with [*insert names of other relevant departments or agencies*].

D. IMPLEMENTATION

The following steps shall be taken [*immediately upon/or within one–two years of*] the effective date of this Policy:

1. All street design standards used in the planning, designing, and implementing phases of Transportation Projects shall be reviewed to ensure that they reflect the best available design guidelines for effectively implementing Complete Streets.
2. [*Insert names of all relevant departments and agencies*] shall incorporate this Policy into relevant internal manuals, checklists, rules, and procedures.
3. [*Insert name of lead agency*] shall assess whether any municipal and zoning codes, land use plans, or other relevant documents, including the Capital Improvement Program [*include all relevant programs, e.g., pavement management program, traffic signal program, tree program, ADA curb ramp program, etc.*], conflict with this Policy, and shall submit a report, along with a proposal for addressing any conflicts, to the [*City Manager or insert relevant position*].
4. [*Insert name of lead agency*] shall provide training on Complete Streets and the implementation of this Policy to all relevant staff, and develop a plan for providing such training for new hires.
5. [*Insert name of lead agency*] shall identify all High Need Areas and develop benchmarks to ensure that Complete Streets are implemented in such areas consistent with their need.
6. [*Insert name of lead agency*] shall identify an existing process or develop a new process that allows for public participation (including participation by bicycle, pedestrian, and Complete Streets advisory committees) in decisions concerning the design, planning, and use of streets and roadways covered by this Policy.
7. [*Jurisdiction*] shall actively seek sources of public and private funding to assist in the implementation of this Policy.
8. EXCEPTIONS TO POLICY
9. A specific category of user may be excluded from the requirements of Section B of this Policy only if one or more of the following exceptions apply:
10. Use of the roadway is prohibited by law for the category of user (e.g., pedestrians on an interstate freeway, vehicles on a pedestrian mall). In this case, efforts shall be made to accommodate the excluded category of user on a parallel route; or
11. There is an absence of both a current and future need to accommodate the category of user (absence of future need may be shown via demographic, school, employment, and public transportation route data that demonstrate, for example, a low likelihood of bicycle, pedestrian, or transit activity in an area over the next 20 years); or
12. The cost would be excessively disproportionate to the current need or future need over the next 20 years.

2. An exception shall be granted only if:

1. a request for an exception is submitted in writing, with supporting documentation, and made publicly available with a minimum of [30] days allowed for public input; and
2. the exception is approved in writing by the [*identify governing body, e.g., City Council or head of lead agency, e.g., Director of the Department of Public Works*], and the written approval is made publicly available.

F. PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In order to evaluate whether the streets and transportation network are adequately serving each category of users, [*insert names of relevant agencies and departments*] shall collect and/or report baseline and annual data on matters relevant to this Policy, including, without limitation, the following information:

1. Mileage by [*district/neighborhood*] of new bicycle infrastructure (e.g., bicycle lanes, paths, and boulevards)
2. Linear feet [*or mileage*] by [*district/neighborhood*] of new pedestrian infrastructure (e.g., sidewalks, trails, etc.)
3. Number by [*district/neighborhood*] of new curb ramps installed
4. Number by [*district/neighborhood*] of new street trees planted
5. Type and number by [*district/neighborhood*] of pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly signage and landscaping improvements, including street furniture and lighting
6. Bicycle and pedestrian counts, including in High Need Areas
7. Commute mode percentages by [*district/neighborhood*] as provided by the American Community Survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau (e.g., drive alone, carpool, transit, bicycle, walk)
8. The percentage by [*district/neighborhood*] of transit stops accessible via sidewalks and curb ramps
9. The number, locations, and cause of collisions, injuries, and fatalities by mode of transportation
10. The total number [*or rate*] by [*district/neighborhood*] of children walking or bicycling to school
11. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) or Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trip reduction data as made available by [*insert name of Metropolitan Planning Organization, county, or other relevant governmental body or agency*].

G. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

One year from the effective date of this Policy, and annually thereafter, the lead agency shall submit a report to the [*insert name of governing body, e.g., city council*] on the progress made in implementing this Policy that includes, at a minimum, the following: (1) baseline and updated performance measures as described in Section (F); (2) a summary of (a) all Transportation Projects planned or undertaken and their status, including a full list and map, with clear identification of which projects are located in High Need Areas; (b) all exceptions granted pursuant to Section E of this Policy, including identification of exceptions granted in High Need Areas; (c) the progress made in achieving the benchmarks for High Need Areas developed pursuant to Section D(5); (d) updates to street design standards, internal department and agency manuals and procedures, zoning and municipal codes, and land use plans, pursuant to Sections D(1)-(3); (e) all funding acquired for projects that enhance the Complete Streets network; (f) all staff trainings and professional development provided pursuant to Section D(4); and (3) any recommendations for improving implementation of this Policy.

1. Health Resources in Action. Public Health Impact: Community Speed Reduction. Boston, MA; 2013. *www.hria.org/uploads/catalogerfiles/2013-speed-reduction-resources/ImpactBrief\_120313.pdf*.

2. New York City Department of Transportation. Making Safer Streets. New York City, NY; 2013. *www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/dot-making-safer-streets.pdf*.

3. What are complete streets and why should we build them? Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center website. *www.pedbikeinfo.org/data/faq\_details.cfm?id=3467*. Accessed June 5, 2015.

4. Rothman L, Macarthur C, To T, Buliung R, Howard A. Motor vehicle-pedestrian collisions and walking to school: the role of the built environment. Pediatrics. 2014;133(5):1-9. doi:10.1542/peds.2013-2317.

5. Jones SJ, Lyons R a, John A, Palmer SR. Traffic calming policy can reduce inequalities in child pedestrian injuries: database study. J Int Soc Child Adolesc Inj Prev. 2005;11(3):152-156. doi:10.1136/ip.2004.007252.

6. Von Kries R, Kohne C, Böhm O, von Voss H. Road injuries in school age children: relation to environmental factors amenable to interventions. J Int Soc Child Adolesc Inj Prev. 1998;4(2):103-105. *www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1730362/pdf/v004p00103.pdf*.

7. American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Traffic Calming, a Livability Fact Sheet. Washington D.C.AARP Livable Communities; Walkable and Livable Communities Institute; 2007.

8. Smart Growth for America. Complete Streets Help People with Disabilities. Washington D.C.

9. Ashmead DH, Guth D, Wall RS, Long RG, Ponchillia PE. Street crossing by sighted and blind pedestrians at a modern roundabout. J Transp Eng. 2005;131(11):812-821. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-947X(2005)131:11(812).

10. U.S. Department of Transportation; National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Traffic Safety Facts 2012 Data. Washington, D.C.: NHTSA’s National Center for Statistics and Analysis; 2014. *www.nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/811888.pdf*.

11. Maciag M. Pedestrians dying at disproportionate rates in America’s poorer neighborhoods. Gov States Localities. 2014. *www.governing.com/topics/public-justice-safety/gov-pedestrian-deaths-analysis.html*. Accessed May 6, 2015.

12. U.S. Department of Transportation; National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Review of Studies on Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety, 1991-2007. Washington D.C.; 2012.

13. Gibbs K, Slater SJ, Nicholson N, Barker DC and CF. Income Disparities in Street Features That Encourage Walking. Chicago, IL: Bridging the Gap Program, Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago; 2012. *www.bridgingthegapresearch.org/\_asset/02fpi3/btg\_street\_walkability\_FINAL\_03-09-12.pdf*.

14. Greenfield J. Why don’t the south and west sides have a fair share of bike facilities? Streetsblog website. 2014. http://chi.streetsblog.org/tag/shawn-conley/. Accessed June 5, 2015.

15. The League of American Bicyclists Sierra Club. The New Majority: Pedaling towards Equity. Washington D.C.; 2013. *www.bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/equity\_report.pdf*.

16. Laflamme L. Accident-zone: poorer neighborhoods have less-safe road designs. Scientific American website. 2012:1-3. *www.scientificamerican.com/article/accident-zone-poorer-neighborhoods/?print=true*. Accessed June 3, 2015.

17. Morency P, Gauvin L, Plante C, Fournier M, Morency C. Neighborhood social inequalities in road traffic injuries: the influence of traffic volume and road design. Am J Public Health. 2012;102(6):1112-1119. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300528.

18. New York City Department of Transportation. Protected Bicycle Lanes in New York City. New York City, NY; 2014. *www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/2014-09-03-bicycle-path-data-analysis.pdf*.

19. Andersen M. Car users would prefer separated bike lanes too, study finds. People for Bikes website. 2013:1-3. *www.peopleforbikes.org/blog/entry/car-users-would-prefer-separated-bike-lanes-too-study-finds*. Accessed June 3, 2015.

20. National Complete Streets Coalition. It’s a Safe Decision, Complete Streets in California. Washington D.C.; 2012. *www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/resources/cs-in-california.pdf*.

21. Teschke K, Harris MA, Reynolds CCO, et al. Route infrastructure and the risk of injuries to bicyclists: a case-crossover study. Am J Public Health. 2012;102(12):2336-2343. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.300762.

22. New York City Department of Transportation. Measuring the Street: New Metrics for 21st Century Streets. New York City, NY *www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/2012-10-measuring-the-street.pdf*.

23. National Complete Streets Coalition; Smart Growth America. Complete Streets Improve Safety. Washington D.C.; 2009. *www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/factsheets/cs-safety.pdf*.

24. Reynolds CCO, Harris MA, Teschke K, Cripton P a, Winters M. The impact of transportation infrastructure on bicycling injuries and crashes: a review of the literature. Environ Heal. 2009;8(47):1-19. doi:10.1186/1476-069X-8-47.

25. Winters M, Brauer M, Setton EM, Teschke K. Built environment influences on healthy transportation choices: bicycling versus driving. J Urban Heal. 2010;87(6):969-993. doi:10.1007/s11524-010-9509-6.

26. Morrison DS, Thomson H, Petticrew M. Evaluation of the health effects of a neighbourhood traffic calming scheme. J epidemiol community Heal. 2004;58(10):837-840. doi:10.1136/jech.2003.017509.

27. National Complete Streets Coalition; Smart Growth America. Complete Streets Change Travel Patterns. Washington D.C.

28. Memphis L. Cities and businesses discover that cycling pays. Urbanful website. 2013:1-8. *https://urbanful.org/2015/03/02/cities-and-businesses-discover-that-cycling-pays/?utm\_source=Urbanful+Master+List&utm\_campaign=c64d6e99aa-March\_2\_Newsletter\_A\_B\_Test3\_2\_2015&utm\_medium=email&utm\_term=0\_fdf64fbc84-c64d6e99aa-197206929*. Accessed May 6, 2015.

29. Smart Growth America. Safer Streets, Stronger Economy: Complete Streets Project Outcomes from across the Country. Washington D.C.; 2015. *www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/safer-streets-stronger-economies.pdf*.

30. New York City Department of Transporation. The Economic Benefits of Sustainable Streets. New York City, NY; 2013. *www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/dot-economic-benefits-of-sustainable-streets.pdf*.

31. Cortright J. Walking the Walk: How Walkability Raises Home Values in U.S. Cities. Clevland, OH: CEOs for Cities; 2009. *www.reconnectingamerica.org/assets/Uploads/2009WalkingTheWalkCEOsforCities.pdf*.

32. National Complete Streets Coalition; Smart Growth America. Complete Streets Stimulate the Local Economy. Washington D.C. *www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/cs/factsheets/cs-economic.pdf*.

33. AARP Public Policy Institute. What Is Livable? Community Preference for Older Adults. Washington D.C.; 2014. *www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/research/public\_policy\_institute/liv\_com/2014/what-is-livable-report-AARP-ppi-liv-com.pdf*.

34. Litman T. Evaluating Complete Streets, the Value of Designing Roads for Diverse Modes, Users and Activities. Victoria, Canada: Victoria Transportation Policy Institute; 2014. *www.vtpi.org/compstr.pdf*.

35. National Association of Regional Councils. Livability Literature Review: A Synthesis of Current Practice. Washington D.C.; 2012. *http://narc.org/wp-content/uploads/Livability-Report-FINAL.pdf*.

36. Victoria Transportation Policy Institute. Evaluating Active Transportation Benefits and Costs. Victoria, Canada; 2015.

37. Maggie L. Grabow, Scott N. Spak, Tracey Holloway, Brian Stone Jr., Adam C. Mednick and JAP. Air quality and exericse-related health benefits from reduced car travel in the midwestern United States. Environ Health Perspect. 2012;120(1):68-76.

38. California Air Resource Board California Environmental Protection Agency. Bicycle Fact Sheet.; 2015. *www.arb.ca.gov/planning/tsaq/bicycle/factsht.htm*.

39. Alliance for Biking and Walking. Bicycling and Walking in the United States: 2014 Benchmarking Report. www.bikewalkallinace.org/resources/benchmarking.

40. National Complete Streets Coalition. Complete Streets Promote Good Health. Washington D.C.; 2004.

41. Physical Activity and Health. Center for Disease Control and Prevention website. *www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/everyone/health/index.html?s\_cid=cs\_284*. Accessed June 12, 2015.

42. Surgeon General’s Perspectives: the importance of 60 minutes or more of daily physical activity. Public Health Reports website. 2013. *www.publichealthreports.org/issueopen.cfm?articleID=3002*. Accessed June 11, 2015.

43. ChangeLab Solutions. Getting the Wheels Rolling: A Guide to Using Policy to Create Bicycle Friendly Communities. Oakland, CA; 2013.

44. Lee I-M, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT. Impact of physical inactivity on the world’s major non-communicable diseases. Lancet. 2012;380(9838):219-229. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61031-9.Impact.

45. Nemours.Health & Prevention Services. Counties and Municipalities in Delaware Can Develop Complete Streets to Combat Childhood Obesity. Newark, Delaware; 2009.