



Smart Growth America  
Improving lives by improving communities



National Complete  
Streets Coalition

# The Best Complete Streets Policies of 2016

June 2017



## Acknowledgments

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.

**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).

### Project team:

Emiko Atherton, Director, National Complete Streets Coalition  
Alex Dodds, Communications Director, Smart Growth America  
Mary Eveleigh, Program Associate, National Complete Streets Coalition  
Heather Zaccaro, Health Program Associate, National Complete Streets Coalition

### Research assistants:

Yuri Chang, Communications Associate, Smart Growth America  
Cornelius Fletcher, Communications Intern, LOCUS: Responsible Real Estate Developers and Investors  
Brian Lutenecker, Research and Policy Intern, Smart Growth America  
Michael Rodriguez, Director of Research, Smart Growth America  
Geri Rosenberg, Program Associate, Smart Growth America  
Stephen Skilton, Economic Analyst, Smart Growth America  
Sam Sklar, Program Associate, Smart Growth America

Additional thanks to the National Complete Streets Coalition Steering Committee:

Debra Alvarez, AARP  
Adam Goldberg, AARP  
Coralette Hannon, AARP  
Ignacio Bunster-Ossa, AECOM  
Heidi Simon, America Walks  
Katherine Robb, American Public Health Association  
Arthur Guzzetti, American Public Transportation Association  
Richard Weaver, American Public Transportation Association  
Roxanne Blackwell, American Society of Landscape Architects  
Tom Bertulis, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals  
Melanie Bowzer, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals  
Byron Rushing, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals  
Kate Whitfield, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals  
Steve Lavrenz, Institute of Transportation Engineers

Jeff Lindley, Institute of Transportation Engineers  
Jeff Riegner, Institute of Transportation Engineers/Whitman, Requardt & Associates  
Nathan Polanski, MIG | SvR Design Company  
Tom Von Schrader, MIG | SvR Design Company  
Linda Bailey, National Association of City Transportation Officials  
Corinne Kisner, National Association of City Transportation Officials  
Adriann Murawski, National Association of REALTORS®  
Hugh Morris, National Association of REALTORS®  
Drusilla van Hengel, Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates Inc.  
Geoff Anderson, Smart Growth America  
Randy Neufeld, SRAM  
Mike Rutkowski, Stantec  
Tim Vaske, Voices for Healthy Kids  
Mike Jelen, VHB  
Roger Millar, Washington State DOT

# Table of contents

- Executive Summary..... 2**
- Introduction..... 4**
- An overview of policies and how we evaluate them ..... 5**
- National trends in Complete Streets ..... 6**
  - Focusing on implementation ..... 9
  - Centering equity..... 9
- The best Complete Streets policies of 2016 ..... 11**
- Conclusion ..... 12**
- Appendix A: Methodology and ideal policy language ..... 13**
  - Elements of a Complete Streets policy ..... 13
  - A note on plans and design guidance ..... 24
- Appendix B: All policy scores..... 26**
- Endnotes ..... 27**

## Executive Summary

As of the end of 2016, more than 1,000 jurisdictions in the United States have made formal commitments to streets that are safe and convenient for everyone—no matter their age, income, race, ethnicity, physical ability, or how they choose to travel—by passing a Complete Streets policy.

More communities passed these policies in 2016 than ever before. Communities adopted a total of 222 new Complete Streets policies that year. Nationwide, a total of 1,232 policies are now in place, in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, including 33 state governments, 77 regional planning organizations, and 955 individual municipalities.

These policies are the strongest ever passed. When the National Complete Streets Coalition first evaluated Complete Streets policies in 2006, the median score was 34 and by 2015 the median score had risen to 68.4. In 2016, the median score leapt to 80.8. Before 2012, no policy had scored higher than 90. And it wasn't until 2015 that any policy scored a perfect 100. In 2016, 51 policies scored a 90 or higher, including 3 policies that scored a perfect 100. These gains are a testament to communities' commitment to passing strong, impactful policies.

Specifically, thirteen communities led the nation in creating and adopting comprehensive Complete Streets policies in 2016:

Rank	Jurisdiction	Policy score
1	Brockton, MA	100.0
1	Missoula, MT	100.0
1	Wenatchee, WA	100.0
2	Hull, MA	98.4
2	Mansfield, MA	98.4
2	Sherborn, MA	98.4
3	Bridgewater, MA	96.8
3	Brookline, MA	96.8
4	Chester, MA	96.0
4	Muskogee, OK	96.0
5	Ayer, MA	95.2
5	Wales, MA	95.2
5	Binghamton Metropolitan Transportation Study, NY	95.2

By passing strong Complete Streets policies these communities are making a clear commitment to streets that are safe and convenient for everyone. And they do so at a time when our country desperately needs safer options for biking and walking. As a nation we face an epidemic of obesity and its related illnesses. The U.S. Surgeon General has recommended making biking and walking a routine part of daily life to help address this health crisis, yet in too many communities streets are not built to safely accommodate these activities. Our recent report *Dangerous by Design 2016* outlined the enduring problem of pedestrian fatalities in the United States, and highlighted the 46,149 people who were struck and killed by cars while walking between 2005 and 2014. Over that period Americans were seven times as likely to be killed as a pedestrian than by a natural disaster. During the same period, more than 7,000 people were killed while biking.

*Dangerous by Design 2016* also showed that people of color and older adults are overrepresented among pedestrian deaths, and that pedestrian risk is correlated with median household income as well as rates of uninsured individuals. That means people of color most likely face disproportionately unsafe conditions for walking, and low-income metro areas are predictably more dangerous than higher-income ones.

Because of this context, for the first time this year we looked at the income and racial demographics of the communities included in our analysis. The data showed that 2016 communities passing or updating a Complete Streets policy in 2016 were, on average, slightly more white and more wealthy than the United States as a whole. The average racial makeup of these communities was 76.3 percent white, 10.3 percent Black or African American, 0.8 percent American Indian, 5.3 percent Asian, 0.1 percent Pacific Islander, 4.1 percent Other, and 3.1 percent two or more races. In all, 77 percent of localities that passed policies in 2016 had white populations greater than the national average of 73.6 percent. The median household income of communities who passed or updated a policy in 2016 was \$59,347, about 10 percent above the national average of \$53,889.

Taken together, it is clear that communities are consistently passing stronger and more effective Complete Streets policies. This is an outstanding accomplishment, and one that we could not be more proud and honored to celebrate. It is also clear that our challenge now is to help communities of all income levels and ethnicities benefit from this progress equitably.

Toward that goal, the Coalition is in the process of updating our policy scoring rubric to give more weight to equity considerations as well as implementation. We will make the new standards public later this year, and will begin using the updated rubric to analyze policies moving forward.

Congratulations to all the jurisdictions that passed Complete Streets policies in 2016, particularly those receiving the highest scores in the Coalition's analysis. You are setting an example for communities everywhere to follow, and we look forward to working with other communities on passing new policies and putting them in to practice in the year to come.

## Introduction

Complete Streets is more than a checklist. It's a frame of mind. A Complete Streets approach integrates the needs of people and place in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation networks. Complete Streets redefines what a transportation network looks like, which goals a transportation agency is going to meet, and how a community prioritizes its transportation spending. It breaks down the traditional separation in planning for different modes of travel, and emphasizes context-sensitive, multimodal project planning, design, and implementation. In doing so, a Complete Streets approach can make streets safer and more convenient for everyone, no matter their age, race, ethnicity, income, physical ability, or how they choose to travel.

More and more communities are using a Complete Streets approach. In 2016, jurisdictions in the United States passed 222 new Complete Streets policies. And nationally 1,232 policies are now in place in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

This growing interest in Complete Streets comes at a unique national moment. In the United States today, demand for real estate in walkable neighborhoods with diverse transportation choices is at a new high. San Francisco and New York are the most commonly cited examples, but it is a trend playing out in smaller cities, suburbs, and towns across the country. For perhaps the first time in 60 years, walkable urban places are gaining market share over their drivable suburban competition—and commanding significant price premiums in real estate.<sup>1</sup>

Walkable neighborhoods' price divide is creating a subsequent health divide. As real estate values in walkable neighborhoods climb, lower-income residents are being forced out to areas without these active transportation options. People's health is suffering as a result: research has shown that people living in dense cities are thinner and have healthier hearts than people in sprawling subdivisions.<sup>2</sup>

These health impacts are now an epidemic. More than two-thirds of Americans today are considered overweight or obese.<sup>3</sup> Yet fewer than half of adults meet recommended guidelines for aerobic physical activity.<sup>4</sup> The U.S. Surgeon General has recommended more biking and walking as ways to address America's obesity crisis, but in many communities streets are simply not safe enough for these activities. Over the 10 years between 2005 and 2014, 46,149 people were struck and killed by cars while walking in the United States.<sup>5</sup> During this same time period, more than 7,000 people were killed while biking.<sup>6</sup> And while pedestrian fatalities occur in communities of all sizes, some populations are affected more severely than others. People of color and older adults are overrepresented among pedestrian deaths. And our Pedestrian Danger Index—the likelihood of someone to be struck and killed by a car while walking in a given place—is correlated with both income and rates of uninsured individuals, meaning that people in low income communities or in communities with lower rates of health insurance are more likely to be struck and killed by a car while walking.<sup>7</sup>

For all these reasons and more, communities want to make it safer and easier for people to bike, walk, wheelchair roll, and take transit as well as drive to where they need to go. A Complete Streets policy is one of the most important ways communities to do this. The good news is that hundreds of communities are using this approach. This report looks at some of the best.

## An overview of policies and how we evaluate them

Complete Streets policies are a jurisdiction’s formal commitment to fund, plan for, construct, operate, and maintain their streets with all users in mind. The Coalition recognizes several types of statements in our definition of a Complete Streets policy, including legislation, resolutions, executive orders, internal policies, policies adopted by an elected board, tax ordinances, comprehensive or master plans, and design guidance.

Complete Streets **legislation** includes bills that require 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. **Internal 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 statements, usually developed by a group of stakeholders, and are approved by an elected governing body via an adopting resolution or ordinance. **Tax ordinances** are a legislative or voter-approved ordinance to fund Complete Streets projects. This report analyzes all the above types of policy documents.

In addition, some communities incorporate Complete Streets language into comprehensive or transportation master plans, or through updates to street design guidance and standards. These documents are not eligible for our analysis.

This report evaluates the language of eligible Complete Streets policies based on a comprehensive policy model that includes ten ideal elements:

- **Vision:** The policy establishes a motivating vision for why the community wants Complete Streets: to improve safety, promote better health, make overall travel more efficient, improve the convenience of choices, or for other reasons.
- **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.
- **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.
- **Clear, accountable exceptions:** Any exceptions to the policy are specified and approved by a high-level official.
- **Network:** The policy recognizes the need to create a comprehensive, integrated and connected network for all modes and encourages street connectivity.
- **Jurisdiction:** All other agencies that govern transportation activities can clearly understand the policy’s application and may be involved in the process as appropriate.
- **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.
- **Context sensitivity:** The current and planned context—buildings, land use, transportation, and community needs—is considered in when planning and designing transportation solutions.
- **Performance measures:** The policy includes performance standards with measurable outcomes.
- **Implementation steps:** Specific next steps for implementing the policy are described.


Members of the Coalition’s Steering Committee along with our workshop instructors developed the ten ideal policy elements. Based on decades of collective experience in transportation planning and design, the ten elements are a national model of best practice that can be employed in nearly all types of Complete Streets policies at all levels of governance.

Our analysis examines how jurisdictions have incorporated the best practices into their policies. More information about our ideal elements—and ideas for how your community can pass an outstanding policy of its own—is included in Appendix A on page 13.

## National trends in Complete Streets

In 2016, communities adopted a total of 222 new Complete Streets policies—nearly double the 114 policies adopted in 2015. Nationwide, a total of 1,232 policies are now in place (see Figure 1 below) in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.


FIGURE 1  
Complete Streets policies adopted, over time



These policies are in place at nearly all levels of government. Thirty-three state governments, 77 regional and metropolitan planning organizations, and 955 individual municipalities now have Complete Streets policies in place. Of the 955 municipalities that have policies in place, large cities have passed 50, mid-sized cities have passed 55, small cities have passed 131, large suburbs have passed 44, mid-sized suburbs have passed 109, small suburbs have passed 290, towns have passed 241, rural cities have passed 2, and rural places have passed 33 (see Figure 2 on page 7). In addition, 14 of the 15 most populous cities in the United States also have a Complete Streets policies in place.<sup>8</sup>




FIGURE 2  
Municipalities with Complete Streets policies, by size



The types of policies jurisdictions adopted were equally diverse. Of the 222 policies passed or updated in 2016, 98 were policies from an elected board, 49 were non-binding resolutions, 58 were legislation, 9 were plans, 4 were design guidelines, 3 were executive orders, and 1 was an internal policy. Of the 1,232 policies in place nationwide, 542 are resolutions, 299 are policies, 208 are legislation, 85 are plans, 42 are internal policies, 14 are executive orders, 3 are tax ordinances, and 39 are included in design standards (see Figure 3, below).

FIGURE 3  
All Complete Streets policies, by type




Communities in Massachusetts adopted the most policies in 2016—86 in total. Washington State followed, passing 46 that year. Both Massachusetts and Washington State have incentive programs that encourage localities to pass policies. Following these two states, Illinois passed 13 policies in 2016 and New York passed 12.

New Jersey continues to have the most policies in place overall, with 145. Massachusetts, by adding 86 policies in 2016 alone, leapt up the list of state policy totals and now has 119 in place. California is not far behind with 107, Michigan has 103, Washington State has 91, and New York 75. Nationwide, there are now 30 states with 10 or more policies at the local, regional, or state level.

The quality of Complete Streets policies also made a monumental leap forward this year, thanks in large part to the large number of outstanding policies passed in Massachusetts. When the Coalition first analyzed Complete Streets policies in 2006, the median score was 34. By 2015, that number had risen to 68.4. In 2016, the median score leapt to 80.8 (see Figure 4 below). Before 2012, no policy had ever scored higher than 90. And it wasn't until 2015 that any policy scored a perfect 100. In 2016, 51 policies scored a 90 or higher, including 3 policies that scored a perfect 100. These gains are a testament to communities' commitment to passing strong, impactful policies.

FIGURE 4  
Median policy score, over time



The rise in scores in 2016 was a direct result of an increase in policies that address users of all abilities, more modes of transportation, the importance of building transportation networks, context sensitivity, and design guidance.

- 94.6 percent of policies scored from 2016 covered "all abilities", in contrast to 87.9 percent of all scored policies over time.
- 94.6 percent of policies scored from 2016 covered "all ages", in contrast to 79.5 percent of all scored policies over time.
- 96.1 percent of policies scored from 2016 covered additional transportation modes beyond bike/pedestrian/transit, in contrast with 85.8 percent of all scored policies over time.
- 88.3 percent of policies scored from 2016 mentioned the importance of a connected, integrated street network, in contrast to 59.6 percent of all scored policies over time.
- 75.1 percent of policies scored from 2016 mentioned sensitivity to context, in contrast to 57.6 percent of all scored policies over time.
- 79.0 percent of policies scored from 2016 mentioned design guidance, in contrast to 49.5 percent of all scored policies over time.

## Focusing on implementation

Complete Streets policies cannot achieve their ambitious goals unless they are thoughtfully and thoroughly implemented. To do this, departments of transportation must change the way they operate, including changing their project development process, design guidelines, and performance measures. This is most successfully done through training, education, and strong leadership and as you can imagine, it is often daunting. Jurisdictions can help with this by including language about implementation in their Complete Streets policy.

Because implementation is so important, we give it considerable weight in our scoring. The good news is that the vast majority of policies passed in 2016 contained language about implementation:

- 89.8 percent of policies scored from 2016 mentioned at least two implementation steps, in contrast to 64.5 percent of all scored policies over time.
- 69.8 percent of policies scored from 2016 established a reporting requirement or committee, in contrast to 33.4 percent of all scored policies over time.

This year's policies' inclusion of implementation means more and more practitioners are thinking about all the steps needed to make a Complete Streets approach a reality.

## Centering equity

This year for the first time we analyzed the income and racial demographics of the 205 jurisdictions eligible for our 2016 scoring. Of those 205, an additional 3 were excluded from our demographics analysis since they encompassed multiple jurisdictions. Using data from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey 2015 five-year estimates we looked at the median income of communities that passed policies in 2016 as well as their racial demographics.

We found that these communities were more white and more wealthy than the U.S. as a whole. The data showed that 77 percent of localities that passed policies in 2016 had white populations greater than the national average of 73.6 percent. The average racial makeup of communities that passed or updated a Complete Streets policy in 2016 was 76.3 percent white, 10.3 percent Black or African American, 0.8 percent American Indian, 5.3 percent Asian, 0.1 percent Pacific Islander, 4.1 percent Other, and 3.1 percent two or more races.

It is important to note that of the 202 policies included in our equity analysis, 132 (or 65 percent) were passed in Massachusetts or Washington State. Both of these states are more white than the national average, and they both have incentive programs that encourage Complete Streets policy development. If these two states are excluded, 56 percent of localities that passed policies in 2016 had white populations greater than average.

The data also showed that 2016 communities were more wealthy than the U.S. as a whole. The median income of communities that passed or updated a policy in 2016 was \$59,347, about 10 percent above the national average of \$53,889.<sup>9</sup> When excluding Massachusetts and Washington, the median income of communities that passed or updated a policy in 2016 dropped to \$52,936.

These trends mean that many low-income communities and communities of color are not accessing the economic and safety benefits of a Complete Streets approach at the same rate as other communities. Compounding this is the fact that these communities are overrepresented among pedestrian fatalities, and perhaps in most dire need of safer streets for people biking and walking. Our *Dangerous by Design 2016* report showed that non-white individuals account for 34.9 percent of the national population but make up 46.1 percent of pedestrian deaths.<sup>10</sup> Even after controlling for the relative amounts of walking among these populations, risks continue to be higher for some people of color and older adults—indicating that these people most likely face disproportionately unsafe conditions for walking.<sup>11</sup>

That report's Pedestrian Danger Index, or PDI, was also correlated with median household income and rates of uninsured individuals. Low-income metro areas were predictably more dangerous than higher-income ones: as median household incomes drop, PDI rises. Similar trends bear out with rates of uninsured individuals: as rates of uninsured individuals rise, so do PDIs, meaning that the people who can least afford to be injured often live in the most dangerous places.

Complete Streets aim to provide safe, affordable, convenient, and reliable transportation networks for all users of all abilities, but especially the most vulnerable. As median policy scores continue to rise year over year and communities across the country reliably pass strong policies, the Coalition is dedicated to helping more vulnerable communities realize the benefits of a Complete Streets approach.

To that end, the Coalition will begin using a new scoring rubric that more heavily accounts for equity and diversity as well as implementation. This is in line with the Coalition's five-year strategic goals and values. We will unveil the new rubric later this year, and use it to analyze Complete Streets policies passed in 2017. We look forward to supporting communities as they make equity and implementation a more prominent focus of Complete Streets policies in the years to come.



## The best Complete Streets policies of 2016

Each year the National Complete Streets Coalition analyzes new Complete Streets policies to understand trends, understand what local communities are choosing to prioritize, and to model outstanding policy language for other communities.

Of the 222 policies passed in 2016, 205 were eligible for our analysis. Each of these policies was evaluated based on the established elements of an ideal Complete Streets policy (outlined on page 5 and discussed in more detail in Appendix A, starting on page 13). The Coalition awarded up to five points for how well policies met each of the ten elements of an ideal policy. Scores were weighted to emphasize more important elements.

Based on these scores, we are proud to announce the following communities have the best Complete Streets policies of 2016:

TABLE 1  
The best Complete Streets policies of 2016

Rank	Jurisdiction	Policy score
1.	Brockton, MA	100.0
1.	Missoula, MT	100.0
1.	Wenatchee, WA	100.0
2.	Hull, MA	98.4
2.	Mansfield, MA	98.4
2.	Sherborn, MA	98.4
3.	Bridgewater, MA	96.8
3.	Brookline, MA	96.8
4.	Chester, MA	96.0
4.	Muskogee, OK	96.0
5.	Ayer, MA	95.2
5.	Wales, MA	95.2
5.	Binghamton Metropolitan Transportation Study, NY	95.2

These are the policies with the top scores of 2016. The full list of scores for all communities that have ever passed a Complete Streets policy, including all other policies from 2016, is available in Appendix B starting on page 28.

## Conclusion

More communities passed Complete Streets policies in 2016 than any previous year, and the policies passed in 2016 were also the strongest of all time. Both these facts are a testament to communities' dedication to making streets safer and more convenient for everyone, no matter their age, income, race, ethnicity, physical ability, or how they choose to travel.

Our work now will be to help communities of all income levels and ethnicities make their streets safer for everyone. We'll approach this work in a number of ways. We are inviting new partner organizations to join the Coalition's work, and we are asking for their input about how our work can better serve.

In addition, and most relevant to this report, we plan to change the way we evaluate policy language next year. We are in the process of updating the scoring rubric we use to evaluate policies, to give more weight to equity factors. This is in line with the Coalition's five-year strategic goals and values. We will unveil the new rubric later this year, and use it to analyze Complete Streets policies moving forward.

This shift is possible because communities are consistently passing strong Complete Streets policies. For the second year in a row, the highest policy score this year was a perfect 100—and not one but three 2016 policies achieved it. This and other signs of outstanding quality policies means it is time for Coalition to move our goalposts and bring a Complete Streets approach to communities with the highest need.

Congratulations to this year's best policies, and to every community that expressed their commitment to streets that are safer and work for everyone by passing a Complete Streets policy last year. We are excited to work with communities everywhere on these new horizons, and to help create the next best Complete Streets policies of years to come.

## Appendix A: Methodology and ideal policy language

The National Complete Streets Coalition has established an objective set of ten ideal policy elements to help communities under the best practices needed to implement Complete Streets. The Coalition's Steering Committee and its workshop instructors developed the elements based on years of experience and research.

The following section provides more information about these ideals, and highlights of these ideals in this year's policies.

More information about writing Complete Streets policies is available in our *Complete Streets Local Policy Workbook*. Download your copy at <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/complete-streets-local-policy-workbook/>.

### 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 element 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, stating unequivocally that facilities meeting 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,” “Complete Streets principles,” or “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 a road for other users, that only some roads should be “complete streets,” and even that these roads require special, separately funded “amenities.”

EXAMPLE POLICY: VISION AND INTENT

**Binghamton Metropolitan Transportation Study, NY**

“The BMTS Complete Streets Policy builds upon these efforts and promotes a multimodal transportation system. Its main objective is to design, build, and maintain roads (including multi-use trails) that safely and comfortably accommodate all users of roadways, including motorists, motorcyclists, bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and school bus riders, delivery and service personnel, freight haulers, and emergency responders. It includes people of all ages and abilities.

The development of multi-use trail facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists is integral in creating a multimodal transportation system by supplementing roadway facilities. Thus, this Complete Streets Policy supports multi-use trail development, in particular the implementation of the Two Rivers Greenway.

Building Complete Streets provides many benefits to residents, business owners, developers, and the community as a whole. First and foremost, embracing the complete streets concept will create balanced transportation systems by providing accessible, safe, and efficient connections between destinations. Additionally, complete streets will encourage economic growth, increase property values, reduce crashes through safety improvements, improve public health and fitness, reduce harmful emissions, and reduce the overall demand on our roadways by allowing people to replace motor vehicle trips with active transportation options. Finally, integrating sidewalks, bike facilities, transit amenities, or safe crossings into the initial design of a project spares the expense and complications of retrofits later.

The desired outcome of the Complete Streets Policy is to create an equitable, balanced, and effective transportation system where every roadway user can travel safely and comfortably, and where sustainable transportation options are available to everyone.

The goals of this Complete Streets policy are:

- To create a comprehensive, integrated, and connected transportation network that supports compact, sustainable development and provides livable communities.
- To ensure safety, ease of use, and ease of transfer between modes for all users of the transportation system.
- To provide context sensitive design flexibility for different types of streets, areas, and 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.
- Required/0 points: Policy includes walking and bicycling.

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 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.

#### EXAMPLE POLICY: ALL USERS AND MODES

##### **Sherborn, MA**

“The purpose of the Town of Sherborn Complete Streets Policy is to provide safe, convenient transportation routes for users of our roadways, pathways and sidewalks, for the benefit of people of all ages and all abilities. This will include pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, commercial vehicles, transit vehicles, emergency vehicles, and users of wheelchairs and other power-driven mobility devices. Furthermore, the Complete Streets Policy is to accommodate all road users by creating a road network that meets the needs of individuals utilizing a variety of transportation modes. The policy directs decision makers to consistently plan, design, and construct streets to accommodate all anticipated users including, but not limited to, pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, emergency vehicles, and commercial vehicles.”

### 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.
- 0 points: Policy does not apply to projects beyond newly constructed roads, or is not clear regarding its application.

- 2 additional points available: Policy clearly includes maintenance, operations, resurfacing, repaving, or other types of changes to the transportation system.

#### EXAMPLE POLICY: ALL PROJECTS AND PHASES

##### **Hull, MA**

“The Town of Hull’s Complete Streets policy will focus on developing a connected, integrated network that serves all road users. Complete Streets support economic growth and community stability by providing accessible and efficient connections between home, school, work, recreation and retail destinations by improving the pedestrian and vehicular environments throughout the Town. In Hull, Complete Streets will be integrated into policies, planning, and design of all types of public and private projects, including new construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair, and maintenance of transportation facilities on streets and redevelopment projects.

The Town of Hull recognizes that “Complete Streets” may be achieved through single elements incorporated into a particular project or incrementally through a series of smaller improvements or maintenance activities over time.”

## 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:

- Transit accommodations are not required where there is no existing or planned transit service.
- Routine maintenance of the transportation network that does not change the roadway geometry or operations, such as mowing, sweeping, and spot repair.
- 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 other 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 other exceptions, including those that weaken the intent of the policy, but does not assign responsibility for approval.
- 0 points: Policy lists no exceptions.

#### EXAMPLE POLICY: CLEAR, ACCOUNTABLE EXCEPTIONS

##### **Brockton, MA**

“A. Exceptions to the City of Brockton Complete Streets Ordinance include:

1. Facilities 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 of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use.
3. Documentation of an absence of current and future need.

B. Exceptions Approval Process:

1. Formal exemption review panel should be established, made of representatives from the City's Planning Department, Brockton Traffic Commission, a City Council Member, the Old Colony Planning Council and a member(s) from the pedestrian and bicycle advocacy community, to hear Complete Street exemption proposals.
2. Formal documentation must be filed indicating why facility or project should be exempt from the City of Brockton's Complete Streets Ordinance.
3. If facility is not an interstate freeway or pedestrian mall, clear reasoning must be presented in the formal exemption request as to why said facility or project should

- be exempt.
4. Public hearing should be held to hear opposing views against facility or project exemption. These hearing should be held jointly at planning board meetings or city council meetings to reduce hearing cost and to be sensitive to community time constraints.
  5. Mitigation must be identified in the formal request on how the city or developer will accommodate users who will be restricted. No exemption can be proposed without mitigation.
  6. Vote must be taken at review hearing by the exemption review panel or City Council to allow project or facility to be exempt from Brockton's Complete Street Ordinance.”

## 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.

### EXAMPLE POLICY: NETWORK

#### **Mansfield, MA**

“The Town of Mansfield Complete Streets policy will focus on developing a connected, integrated network that serves all users. Complete Streets will be integrated into policies, planning and design of all types of public and private projects, including new construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair and maintenance of transportation facilities on streets and redevelopment projects. Where sidewalk connections and links are not viable, the Town will seek to expand its trail and walking path network to link neighborhoods. This walking network will be integrated into Mansfield’s Complete Streets policy.”

## 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 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.

EXAMPLE POLICY: JURISDICTION

**Brookline, MA**

“The Town should approach every relevant program, as well as every transportation, public utilities, infrastructure, and public and private development project, as an opportunity to improve the public way and the transportation network for all users. Complete Streets work shall be performed by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and its Transportation Division, and by the Planning and Community Development Department in cooperation with other departments, agencies and jurisdictions as needed. For a project inside the town’s boundaries but outside its jurisdiction, the Town shall advocate that the project comply with the Complete Streets Policy.

All transportation infrastructure and street design projects in Brookline receiving federal, state, municipal, or private funding or requiring approval by the Town should adhere to the Complete Streets Policy. For development projects that require review specified by the Zoning By-law, or development projects affecting the public way, compliance with the Complete Streets Policy will be encouraged, to the extent not prohibited by the Zoning By-law or other relevant laws and regulations. The Department of Planning and Community Development will encourage Town land use boards to consider compliance with the Policy in their deliberations. Private land to be incorporated into the public way by the Town should comply with the Complete Streets Policy.

If a representative of the Town participates in meetings involving the design and planning of programs, transportation projects, or private development projects not under the Town’s jurisdiction, the representative shall advocate that the project be carried out in accordance with the principles of the Complete Streets Policy.”

## 7. Design

Complete Streets implementation relies on using the best and latest design standards to maximize design flexibility. Design solutions are needed 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.
- 0 points: Policy does not address design guidance, balancing of user needs, or design flexibility.
- 2 additional points available: Policy addresses the need for a balanced or flexible design approach.

#### EXAMPLE POLICY: DESIGN

##### **Wenatchee, WA**

“The City of Wenatchee strives to use the best and latest design guidelines, standards and recommendations available when considering methods or providing development flexibility within safe design parameters and balanced design solutions between the user and modal needs. A balanced approach considers aspects such as street design and width, desired operating speed, hierarchy of streets, connectivity, wayfinding signs and signal variation from a human scale for the needs and comforts of All Users. The City will generally follow accepted or adopted design standards when implementing improvements intended to fulfill this Complete Streets policy and will consider innovative or non-traditional design options where a comparable level of safety for users is present. Design criteria shall be based on the thoughtful application of engineering, architectural and urban design principles in addition to prescriptive guidelines. Best practices in policies, design criteria, standards and guidelines related to street design, construction and operations can be found in, but are not limited to, the following:

- Guidelines provided by the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
- Guidelines provided by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- Guidelines provided by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
- Guidelines provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)
- Guidelines provided in the ADA Standards for Accessible Design
- Guidelines provided by the Highway Capacity Manual published by the Transportation Research Board”

## 8. Context sensitivity

An effective Complete Streets policy must be sensitive to the surrounding community, its current and planned buildings, as well as its 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.

EXAMPLE POLICY: CONTEXT SENSITIVITY

**Chester, MA**

“Complete Streets principles include the development and implementation of projects in a context-sensitive manner where project implementation is sensitive to the community’s physical, economic, and social setting. The context-sensitive approach to process and design includes a range of goals by giving significant consideration to stakeholder and community values. It includes goals related to livability with greater participation of those affected in order to gain consensus. The overall goal of this approach is to preserve and enhance scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources while improving or maintaining safety, mobility and infrastructure condition.”

## 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 next element, “Implementation steps.”
- 0 points: Policy does not include any performance measures.

EXAMPLE POLICY: PERFORMANCE MEASURES

**Muskogee, OK**

“Performance Measures

The City of Muskogee shall measure the success of this Complete Streets policy on an annual basis using, but not limited to, the following performance measures:

- Linear feet of new and repaired sidewalk and other pedestrian accommodations (paths, trails, etc.)
- Total miles of new bike lanes (designated and shared-use)
- Number of new and repaired curb ramps installed on streets and parking lots
- Number and type of crosswalk and intersection improvements
- Number of new transit stops and routes
- Percentage of transit stops accessible by sidewalks and/or curb ramps
- Rates of crashes, injuries and fatalities by mode, as available
- Rates of children walking or bicycling to school
- Exceptions to this policy granted

Within six month of policy adoption, the city shall obtain and record baseline data for each of these performance measures. This information shall be submitted by the Public Works Director for review and acceptance by the Complete Streets Subcommittee (AIM Infrastructure Subcommittee), the Street Improvement Advisory Commission, Public Works Committee and City Council. Thereafter, an annual report listing locations and totals for each performance measure shall be submitted by the Public Works Director for review and acceptable by the same committees named immediately above.”

## 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.
- 0 points: Policy does not include any implementation or accountability measures.
- 1 additional point available: Policy identifies a specific person or advisory board to oversee and help drive implementation, or establishes a reporting requirement.
- 1 additional point available: Policy changes the way transportation projects are prioritized.



## EXAMPLE POLICY: IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

### **Missoula, MT**

“The City of Missoula shall view Complete Streets as integral to everyday transportation decision-making practices and processes. To this end, the policy shall be implemented through the following directives:

- Development Services, the Department of Public Works, the Missoula Redevelopment Agency, Parks & Recreation, Missoula Urban Transportation District, and other relevant departments, agencies, and committees will incorporate Complete Streets principles into all existing plans, manuals, checklists, decision-trees, rules, regulations, and programs as appropriate
- Development Services, the Department of Public Works, the Missoula Redevelopment Agency, Parks & Recreation, Missoula Urban Transportation District, and other relevant departments, agencies, and committees will review current design standards, including subdivision regulations, which apply to new roadway construction, to ensure that they reflect the best available design standards and guidelines, and effectively implement Complete Streets, where feasible
- When available, the City shall encourage staff professional development and training on non-motorized transportation issues through attending conferences, classes, seminars, and workshops
- City staff shall identify all current and potential future sources of funding for street improvements and recommend improvements to the project selection criteria to support Complete Streets projects
- The City shall promote inter-departmental project coordination among City departments with an interest in the activities that occur within the public right-of-way in order to better use fiscal resources
- The City shall develop and institute better ways to measure performance and collect data on how well the streets are serving all users
- Every Complete Streets project shall include an educational component to ensure that all users of the transportation system understand and can safely utilize Complete Streets project elements
- The City shall educate on and enforce proper road use behavior by all users and all modes, and adopt additional laws and regulations as necessary to ensure people are protected to the greatest extent possible.”

*Within performance measurements section:*

“A report will be made to the City Council every two years showing progress made in implementing this policy.”

*Within vision, users, and modes section:*

“When there are conflicting needs among users and modes, the following prioritization will apply: (1) above all, safety is paramount, followed by mobility; (2) among modes, pedestrians shall come first citywide, followed by the next most vulnerable types of users; and finally, (3) seek balance among all modes involved. It is recognized that all modes cannot receive the same type of accommodation and space on every street, but the overall goal is that everyone – young, old, and of varying ability – can safely, comfortably, and conveniently travel across the network.”

## 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.

### EXAMPLE POLICY: ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS

#### **Missoula, MT**

A. Storm Water: In addition to providing safe and accessible streets in the City of Missoula, care shall be given to incorporate best management practices for addressing storm water runoff. Wherever possible, innovative and educational storm water infrastructure shall be integrated into the construction/reconstruction or retrofit of a street.

B. Attention to Livability: Complete Streets are beautiful, interesting, vibrant, and comfortable places for people. As part of Missoula’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 Missoula and its public realm through the thoughtful creation of place. Wherever feasible, streetscapes shall protect and include street trees and native plants, incorporate landscape architecture, public art, street furniture, pedestrian amenities and wayfinding signage, sidewalk cafes and street-facing retail, places of respite, and/or other elements.”

## 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: All policy scores**

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
<b>Statewide policies</b>																										
State legislation	State of California	CA	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	44.80
State legislation	State of Colorado	CO	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	27.60
State legislation	State of Connecticut	CT	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	62.80
State legislation	State of Florida	FL	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	23.20
State legislation	State of Hawaii	HI	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	58.60
State legislation	State of Illinois	IL	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	32.40
State legislation	State of Massachusetts	MA	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	28.40
State legislation	State of Maryland	MD	Maryland Trans. Code Ann. Title 2 subtitle 602	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	28.00
State legislation	State of Michigan	MI	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	54.40
State legislation	State of Minnesota	MN	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	64.40
State legislation	State of New York	NY	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	46.80
State legislation	State of Oregon	OR	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	25.20
State legislation	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	PR	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	54.80
State legislation	State of Rhode Island	RI	Rhode Island General Laws Title 31 Chapter 31-18: Pedestrians	2005	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	33.20
State legislation	State of Rhode Island	RI	Chapter 24-16: Safe Access to Public	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	46.80
State legislation	State of Vermont	VT	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	56.40
State legislation	State of Washington	WA	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	30.00
State legislation	State of West Virginia	WV	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	84.80
State resolution	State of Missouri	MO	House Concurrent Resolution 23	2011	5,988,927	1	1.20	5	20.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	26.00
State resolution	South Carolina Department of Transportation	SC	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	20.40
State executive order	State of Delaware	DE	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	39.20
State internal policy	California Department of Transportation	CA	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	71.20
State internal policy	Colorado Department of Transportation	CO	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	61.20
State internal policy	Connecticut Department of Transportation	CT	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	62.40
State internal policy	Washington, DC Department of Transportation	DC	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	66.40
State internal policy	Delaware Department of Transportation	DE	Complete Streets Policy	2009	897,934	3	3.60	2	8.00	0	0.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	35.60
State internal policy	Georgia Department of Transportation	GA	Complete Streets Design Policy	2012	9,687,653	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	62.40
State internal policy	Indiana Department of Transportation	IN	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	74.40
State internal policy	Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development	LA	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	72.00
State internal policy	Massachusetts Department of Transportation	MA	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	80.80
State internal policy	Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration	MD	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	49.60
State internal policy	Maine Department of Transportation	ME	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	74.40
State internal policy	Michigan Department of Transportation	MI	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	67.20
State internal policy	Michigan Department of Transportation	MI	State Transportation Commission Policy on Complete Streets	2012	9,883,640	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	51.20
State internal policy	Minnesota Department of Transportation	MN	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	67.20
State internal policy	Minnesota Department of Transportation	MN	MnDOT Policy OP004	2016	5,303,925	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	69.60
State internal policy	Mississippi Department of Transportation	MS	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	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	31.60
State internal policy	North Carolina Department of Transportation	NC	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	70.40
State internal policy	New Jersey Department of Transportation	NJ	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	80.80
State internal policy	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	PA	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	58.80
State internal policy	Tennessee Department of Transportation	TN	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	36.00
State internal policy	Tennessee Department of Transportation	TN	Multimodal Access Policy TCA 4-3-2303	2015	6,346,105	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	61.60
State internal policy	Texas Department of Transportation	TX	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	21.20
State internal policy	Virginia Department of Transportation	VA	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	50.80
State policy adopted by an elected board	Florida Department of Transportation	FL	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	45.60
State policy adopted by an elected board	Utah Department of Transportation	UT	Inclusion of Active Transportation, UDOT 07-117	2013	2,763,885	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	26.40
<b>Metropolitan planning organization (MPO) policies</b>																										
MPO Resolution	Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham	AL	Resolution	2011	212,237	5	6.00	5	20.00	5</																

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
MPO Resolution	Traverse City Area Transportation and Land Use Study	MI	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	32.40
MPO Resolution	St. Cloud Area Planning Organization	MN	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	17.20
MPO Resolution	Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization	MO	Policy Resolution	2014	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	17.20
MPO Resolution	Las Cruces Metropolitan Planning Organization	NM	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	50.80
MPO Resolution	Mid-Region Council of Governments of New Mexico	NM	R-11-09	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	13.20
MPO Resolution	Santa Fe Metropolitan Planning Organization	NM	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	38.80
MPO Resolution	Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization	TX	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	50.40
MPO Resolution	Brownsville Metropolitan Planning Organization	TX	MPO Resolution Supporting a "Complete Streets" policy	2013	n/a	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	50.40
MPO Resolution	La Crosse Area Planning Committee (La Crosse, WI area), WI	WI	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	44.40
MPO Resolution	Morgantown Monongalia Metropolitan Planning Organization (Morgantown, WV area), WV	WV	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	34.00
MPO executive order	Davidson County, TN	TN	Executive Order No. 40	2010	n/a	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	50.00
MPO executive order	Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, TN	TN	Executive Order #031	2016	n/a	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	82.40
MPO internal policy	Wilmington Area Planning Council (Wilmington, DE area)	DE	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	60.00
MPO internal policy	Quad Cities Area Complete Streets Policy	IA	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	46.00
MPO internal policy	Bi-State Regional Commission, IA Johnson County Council of Governments (Iowa City, IA area)	IA	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	19.60
MPO internal policy	Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (Boise, ID area)	ID	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	34.00
MPO internal policy	Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Bloomington, IN area), IN	IN	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	72.00
MPO internal policy	Madison County Council of Governments (Anderson, IN area), IN	IN	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	68.00
MPO internal policy	Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (Portage, IN area)	IN	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	48.80
MPO internal policy	Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments, ND	ND	Complete Streets Policy Statement	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	64.80
MPO internal policy	Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus, OH area), OH	OH	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	77.60
MPO internal policy	Northeast Ohio Area-wide Coordinating Agency (Cleveland, OH area)	OH	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	42.80
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System (MPO), AK	AK	Policy No. 9 Complete Streets	2015	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	58.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	CA	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	86.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco Bay area)	CA	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	35.60
MPO policy adopted by elected board	San Diego Association of Governments (San Diego, CA area)	CA	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	85.60
MPO policy adopted by elected board	San Diego Association of Governments, CA	CA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	n/a	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	78.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Governments (Washington, DC area)	DC	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	50.00
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Palm Beach Metropolitan Planning Organization, FL	FL	Complete Streets Policy	2016	n/a	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	45.20
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Space Coast Transportation Planning Organization (Viera, FL area)	FL	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	47.20
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Champaign-Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation Study (Champaign, IL area)	IL	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	63.60
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Evansville Metropolitan Planning Organization (Evansville, IN area)	IN	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	63.20
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization (Indianapolis, IN area)	IN	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	78.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Twin Cities Area Transportation Study (Benton Harbor/St. Joseph area, MI)	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	69.60
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments (Rochester, MN area)	MN	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	58.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Mid America Regional Council (Kansas City, MO area)	MO	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	72.80
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Mississippi Gulf Coast MPO, MS	MS	Complete Streets Policy	2015	n/a	3	3.60	1	4.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	34.80
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Greensboro Urban Area MPO, NC	NC	Complete Streets Policy	2015	n/a	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	59.20
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Winston-Salem Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (Winston-Salem, NC area), NC	NC	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	62.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Carson City Regional Transportation Commission, NV	NV	Complete Streets Policy	2014	n/a	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	70.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (Las Vegas, NV area), NV	NV	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	52.40
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Birmingham Metropolitan Transportation Study (Broome and Tioga County MPO)	NY	Complete Streets Policy	2016	n/a	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	5	20.00	95.20
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (Dayton, OH area)	OH	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	88.00



Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score	
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points		Points
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments (Toledo, OH area), OH	OH	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	4	16.00	88.80	
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Coordinating Committee, PA	PA	Elements of a Complete Streets	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	38.80	
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Wasatch Front Regional Council (Salt Lake City, UT, area)	UT	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	42.40	
MPO policy adopted by elected board	Spokane Regional Transportation Council, WA	WA	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	64.80	
<b>County policies</b>																											
County legislation	Honolulu County, HI	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	77.20	
County legislation	Cook County, IL	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	77.60	
County legislation	Montgomery County, MD	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	64.80	
County legislation	Prince George's County, MD	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	45.20	
County legislation	St. Louis County, MO	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	56.00	
County legislation	Bernalillo County, NM	NM	Complete Streets Ordinance	2015	662,564	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.00	
County legislation	Westchester County, NY	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	28.40	
County legislation	Richland County, SC	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	50.80	
County legislation	Richland County, SC	SC	Complete Streets Program Goals and Objectives & Ordinance No. 017-11HR	2011	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	54.80	
County legislation	Salt Lake County, UT	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	64.40	
County legislation	Pierce County, WA	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	30.80	
County resolution	Napa County, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2013-01	2013	136,484	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.60	
County resolution	La Plata County, CO	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	29.20	
County resolution	Lee County, FL	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	66.00	
County resolution	Manatee County, FL	FL	Resolution R-16-036	2016	322,833	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	21.20	
County resolution	Miami-Dade County, FL	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	55.20	
County resolution	DeKalb County, GA	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	50.80	
County resolution	Rockdale County, GA	GA	R-2015-07	2015	85,215	5	6.00	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	81.60	
County resolution	Kauai, HI	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	48.40	
County resolution	Maui County, HI	HI	Resolution	2012	154,934	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	21.20	
County resolution	DuPage County, IL	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	18.00	
County resolution	Johnson County, KS	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	36.40	
County resolution	Genesee County Parks & Recreation Commission, MI	MI	Complete Streets Resluton #009-10	2010	425,790	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	23.20	
County resolution	Grand Traverse County Road Commission, MI	MI	Resolution 13-08-03	2013	89,966	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	24.40	
County resolution	Ingham County Road Commission, MI	MI	Resolution #085-10	2010	280,895	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.60	
County resolution	Jackson County, MI	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	34.00	
County resolution	Clay County, MN	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	60.00	
County resolution	Hennepin County, MN	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	41.20	
County resolution	Wilkin County, MN	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	74.40	
County resolution	Jackson County, MO	MO	Resolution #17963	2012	674,158	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	47.20	
County resolution	Camden County, NJ	NJ	Complete Streets Policy	2013	513,657	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	46.80	
County resolution	Essex County, NJ	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	46.80	
County resolution	Hudson County, NJ	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	44.40	
County resolution	Mercer County, NJ	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	42.80	
County resolution	Middlesex County, NJ	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	29.20	
County resolution	Monmouth County, NJ	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	52.00	
County resolution	Passaic County, NJ	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	40.80	
County resolution	Somerset County, NJ	NJ	Resolution 16-743	2016	323,444	3	3.60	3	12.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	38.00	
County resolution	Doña Ana County, NM	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	64.80	
County resolution	Allegany County Planning Board, NY	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	24.00	
County resolution	Cattaraugus County Planning Board, NY	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	22.00	
County resolution	Chautauque County, NY	NY	Resolution 122-15	2015	134,905	1	1.20	3	12.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.40	
County resolution	Dutchess County, NY	NY	Resolution NO. 2016244	2016	297,488	5	6.00	4	16.00	2	4.80	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	84.80	
County resolution	Erie County, NY	NY																									

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score	
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points		Points
County policy adopted by elected board	Dawson County, MT	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	88.80	
County policy adopted by elected board	Essex County, NY	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	48.00	
County policy adopted by elected board	La Crosse County, WI	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	57.20	
<b>City policies</b>																											
City legislation	Conway, AR	AR	Ordinance No. O-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	32.40	
City legislation	Little Rock, AR	AR	Ordinance Ordinance S-41094 & Ordinance G-5937	2015	193,524	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	85.60	
City legislation	Phoenix, AZ	AZ	Ordinance No. 13153	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	54.00	
City legislation	Oakland, CA	CA	Ordinance No. 857	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	40.40	
City legislation	Rancho Cucamonga, CA	CA	Transit First Policy	2012	165,269	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	74.00	
City legislation	San Francisco, CA	CA	Public Works Code 2.4.13 (Ordinance No. 209-05)	1995	805,235	3	3.60	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	17.20	
City legislation	San Francisco, CA	CA	Ordinance No. 05-16	2005	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	37.20	
City legislation	Middletown, CT	CT	Chapter 231, Article XII	2016	47,648	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	50.80	
City legislation	Stamford, CT	CT	Ordinance No. O-1305-007	2015	122,643	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	58.00	
City legislation	Milledgeville, GA	GA	Article 33 of Chapter 14 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu	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	48.80	
City legislation	Honolulu, HI	HI	Ordinance No. 1116	2012	337,256	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	85.60	
City legislation	Hasley, ID	ID	Ordinance No. 9-2016	2012	7,960	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	63.60	
City legislation	Bensenville, IL	IL	Ordinance No. 11-40	2016	18,352	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	68.80	
City legislation	Berwyn, IL	IL	Ordinance No. 2016-87	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	73.20	
City legislation	Bloomington, IL	IL	Ordinance No. 16-1145	2016	76,610	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	68.40	
City legislation	Blue Island, IL	IL	Complete Streets Policy	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	76.00	
City legislation	Calumet Park, IL	IL	Ordinance NO. 1616	2016	7,835	3	3.60	5	20.00	2	4.80	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	81.60	
City legislation	Oak Park, IL	IL	Ordinance 17,260	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	80.00	
City legislation	Peoria, IL	IL	Ordinance NO. 24706	2015	115,007	5	6.00	0	0.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	92.80	
City legislation	Richton Park, IL	IL	Ordinance No. 14-0-40	2016	13,646	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	68.80	
City legislation	Woodstock, IL	IL	Chapter 431, Article VIII	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	44.40	
City legislation	Indianapolis, IN	IN	Ordinance 13-2015	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	92.80	
City legislation	La Porte, IN	IN	Ordinance NO. 2016-08-02	2015	22,053	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	65.60	
City legislation	LaCrosse, IN	IN	Complete Streets Ordinance 31-2015	2016	551	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	3	12.00	61.60	
City legislation	Vincennes, IN	IN	Ordinance 2012-3	2015	18,423	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	98.00	
City legislation	Raceland, KY	KY	Ordinance 316-2012	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	48.80	
City legislation	South Shore, KY	KY	Ordinance No. 24706	2012	1,122	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	17.20	
City legislation	New Orleans, LA	LA	Ordinances 1825-10-16, 1826-10-16, 1828-10-16	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	70.80	
City legislation	St. Bernard Parish, LA	LA	Ordinance Amending Chapter 20 Streets and Sidewalks of the Revised Ordinance of the City of Brockton	2016	35,897	5	6.00	2	8.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	40.80	
City legislation	Brockton, MA	MA	Mayor's Memorandum Establishing a Safe and Accessible Streets Policy	2016	93810	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	100.00	
City legislation	Gloucester, MA	MA	Section 78-58--Complete Streets	2016	28,789	5	6.00	5	20.00	0	0.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	78.40	
City legislation	Holyoke, MA	MA	City Charter 4.9 Notice	2014	39,880	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	61.60	
City legislation	Lawrence, MA	MA	Complete Streets Bypass	2015	76377	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	81.60	
City legislation	Longmeadow, MA	MA	Ordinance	2015	90,329	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	5	20.00	92.80	
City legislation	Northampton, MA	MA	Chapter 12, Article VII	2015	28,549	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	32.00	
City legislation	Somerville, MA	MA	Ordinance 11-414	2014	75,754	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	64.80	
City legislation	West Springfield, MA	MA	Ordinance 123	2016	28,391	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	5	20.00	92.80	
City legislation	Alpena, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 2010-05	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	46.40	
City legislation	Dahli Township, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 1277	2012	25,877	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	1	4.00	62.40	
City legislation	Dexter, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 1101	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	51.60	
City legislation	East Lansing, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 586	2012	48,579	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	58.00	
City legislation	Ferndale, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 490	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	46.40	
City legislation	Gladstone, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 627	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	51.60	
City legislation	Houghton, MI	MI	Ordinance No. 202	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					

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City legislation	Pagedale, MO	MO	Bill No. 2015-13	2015	3,304	1	1.20	4	16.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	35.20
City legislation	Pevely, MO	MO	Ordinance No. 1238	2010	5,484	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	64.00
City legislation	Pineville, MO	MO	Ordinance 16-11, Livable Streets	2016	791	3	3.60	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	69.60
City legislation	St. Louis, MO	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	49.60
City legislation	St. Louis, MO	MO	Board Bill No. 198 CSAA	2015	319,294	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	69.20
City legislation	Warsaw, MO	MO	Bill No. 2016-22, Ordinance No. 240	2016	2,127	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	80.00
City legislation	Hattiesburg, MS	MS	Ordinance 3068	2011	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	34.40
City legislation	Concord, NC	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	66.40
City legislation	Bellevue, NE	NE	Ordinance Revised General Ordinances Ch. XV Sec. 6	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	36.40
City legislation	Hopewell Township (Mercer), NJ	NJ	Ordinance	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	30.00
City legislation	Point Pleasant, NJ	NJ	Ordinance	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	52.00
City legislation	Albuquerque, NM	NM	O-14-27	2015	545,852	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	52.40
City legislation	Albany, NY	NY	Ordinance	2013	97,856	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	40.40
City legislation	Buffalo, NY	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	49.20
City legislation	Dunkirk, NY	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	31.60
City legislation	Jamestown, NY	NY	Ordinance	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	38.00
City legislation	Ogdensburg, NY	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	92.80
City legislation	Rochester, NY	NY	Ordinance	2011	210,568	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	53.60
City legislation	Troy, NY	NY	'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	91.20
City legislation	Utica, NY	NY	Ordinance Adopting a Complete Streets Policy to be Added as Section 2-31 Complete Streets Policy	2016	62,235	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	61.60
City legislation	Warrensburg, NY	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	9.60
City legislation	Yonkers, NY	NY	An Ordinance Creating a New Article XVI Entitled Complete Streets Policy of Chapter 103 of the Code of the City of Yonkers Entitled Streets and Sidewalks	2016	195,976	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	2	8.00	64.80
City legislation	Cleveland, OH	OH	Ordinance No. 798-11	2011	396,615	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	53.20
City legislation	Columbus, OH	OH	Ordinance No. 1987-2008	2008	787,033	5	6.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	15.20
City legislation	Toledo, OH	OH	Toledo Municipal Code, Chapter 901 (Ordinance 656-10)	2012	287,208	3	3.60	2	8.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.40
City legislation	Pryor Creek, OK	OK	Ordinance No. 2016-01	2016	9,539	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	76.00
City legislation	Philadelphia, PA	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	46.40
City legislation	Conway, SC	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	43.20
City legislation	North Myrtle Beach, SC	SC	Ordinance	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	50.40
City legislation	Chattanooga, TN	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	83.20
City legislation	Knoxville, TN	TN	Ordinance No. O-204-2014	2014	178,874	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	3	12.00	88.80
City legislation	Austin, TX	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	88.80
City legislation	San Marcos, TX	TX	Chapter 74, Sec. 74.002	2013	44,894	5	6.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	39.60
City legislation	Salt Lake City, UT	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	44.00
City legislation	Norfolk, VA	VA	Ordinance No. 46,207	2016	242,803	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	88.80
City legislation	Aberdeen, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.6591	2016	16,896	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	75.20
City legislation	Airway Heights, WA	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	55.20
City legislation	Algona, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.1129-16	2016	3,014	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	84.00
City legislation	Anacortes, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.2880	2012	15,788	5	6.00	3	12.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	43.20
City legislation	Auburn, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.6616	2016	70,180	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	63.20
City legislation	Bellevue, WA	WA	Ordinance NO. 6308	2016	122,363	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	64.00
City legislation	Bellingham, WA	WA	Ordinance NO. 2016-09-032	2016	80,885	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	36.00
City legislation	Bingen, WA	WA	Ordinance NO. 2013-07-617	2013	712	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	34.00
City legislation	Bremerton, WA	WA	Ordinance	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	34.80
City legislation	Burien, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 599	2011	33,313	5	6.00	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	30.40
City legislation	Burien, WA	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	24.40
City legislation	Burlington, WA	WA	Ordinance 1792	2013	8,388	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	44.00
City legislation	Carnation, WA	WA	Ordinance NO. 877	2016	1,786</																					

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City legislation	Lakeview, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.645	2016	58,163	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	71.20
City legislation	Langley, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.970	2012	1,035	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	36.80
City legislation	Mabton, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 2015-1056	2015	2,286	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.60
City legislation	Marysville, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.3031	2016	60,020	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	52.80
City legislation	Moses Lake, WA	WA	Ordinance 2644	2012	20,366	5	6.00	1	4.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	20.40
City legislation	Mountlake Terrace, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 2597	2012	19,909	3	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	33.20
City legislation	Moxee, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 764	2016	3,308	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	3	12.00	72.80
City legislation	Naches, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 712	2016	795	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	68.00
City legislation	North Bonneville, WA	WA	Ordinance Number 1069	2016	956	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	65.60
City legislation	Ocean Shores, WA	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	84.80
City legislation	Olympia, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 7037	2016	46,478	1	1.20	5	20.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	30.00
City legislation	Pomeroy, WA	WA	Ordinance 885	2016	1,425	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	58.40
City legislation	Port Townsend, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 3155	2016	9,113	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	74.80
City legislation	Redmond, WA	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	24.00
City legislation	Renton, WA	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	54.80
City legislation	Republic, WA	WA	Ordinance #2016-04	2016	1,073	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	27.20
City legislation	Ruston, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 1487	2016	749	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	5	20.00	88.00
City legislation	Seattle, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 122386	2007	698,660	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	52.80
City legislation	Sedro-Woolley, WA	WA	Ordinance	2010	10,540	5	6.00	0	0.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	16.40
City legislation	Spokane, WA	WA	Ordinance	2011	208,916	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	62.40
City legislation	Sunnyside, WA	WA	Complete Streets Ordinance	2015	15,858	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.60
City legislation	Tieton, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 716	2016	1,191	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	76.00
City legislation	Toppenish, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 2015-14	2015	8,949	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.60
City legislation	Tukwila, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 2222	2009	19,107	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	64.00
City legislation	Twisp, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 709	2016	919	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	72.00
City legislation	Union Gap, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 2876	2015	6,047	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	4	16.00	80.80
City legislation	Waitsburg, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.2016-1037	2016	1,217	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	3	12.00	67.20
City legislation	Wapato, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.1306	2015	4,997	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.60
City legislation	Wenatchee, WA	WA	Ordinance NO. 2016-24	2016	31,925	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	100.00
City legislation	West Richland, WA	WA	Ordinance No.15-16	2016	11,811	5	6.00	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	68.80
City legislation	White Salmon, WA	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	39.20
City legislation	Wilbur, WA	WA	Ordinance 573	2016	884	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	29.20
City legislation	Winthrop, WA	WA	Ordinance NO.683	2016	394	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	72.00
City legislation	Yakima, WA	WA	Ordinance No. 2016-013	2016	91,067	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	2	8.00	67.20
City legislation	La Crosse, WI	WI	Ordinance No. 4627	2011	51,320	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	3	4.80	2	1.60	0	0.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	60.80
City legislation	La Crosse, WI	WI	Green Streets Ordinance, Sec. 40-14	2016	51,320	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	72.80
City legislation	Cairo, WV	WV	Ordinance	2011	261	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	50.00
City legislation	Elizabeth, WV	WV	Ordinance	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	50.00
City legislation	Ellenboro, WV	WV	Ordinance	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	50.00
City resolution	Fairbanks, AK	AK	Resolution No. 4704	2015	97,581	3	3.60	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	11.60
City resolution	North Pole, AK	AK	Resolution 15-23	2015	2,117	3	3.60	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	11.60
City resolution	Anniston, AL	AL	Resolution No. 12-R-181	2012	23,106	3	3.60	0	0.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	15.20
City resolution	Bessemer, AL	AL	Resolution	2012	27,456	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	36.80
City resolution	Chickasaw, AL	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	31.60
City resolution	Daphne, AL	AL	Resolution No. 2009-111	2009	21,570	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	0	0.00	23.60
City resolution	Fairhope, AL	AL	Resolution No. 1570-09	2009	15,326	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	0	0.00	23.60
City resolution	Homewood, AL	AL	Resolution No. 12-51	2012	25,167	1	1.20	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	36.80
City resolution	Midfield, AL	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.							

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	Hillsborough, CA	CA	Resolution No. 12-	2012	10,825	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	67.20
City resolution	Los Altos, CA	CA	Resolution 2015-41	2015	28,976	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.60
City resolution	Martinez, CA	CA	Resolution No. 12	2012	35,824	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	54.40
City resolution	Menlo Park, CA	CA	Resolution No. 61-23	2013	32,026	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	75.20
City resolution	Mill Valley, CA	CA	Resolution	2013	13,903	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	80.00
City resolution	Millbrae, CA	CA	Resolution	2013	21,532	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.60
City resolution	Monte Sereno, CA	CA	Resolution No. 3497	2012	3,341	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.60
City resolution	Moraga, CA	CA	Resolution No. 93-2015	2015	16,016	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	78.40
City resolution	Novato, CA	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	21.20
City resolution	Oakley, CA	CA	Resolution No. XX-13	2013	35,432	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	62.40
City resolution	Ontario, CA	CA	Resolution NO. 2016-095	2016	163,924	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	23.20
City resolution	Orinda, CA	CA	Resolution No. 67-12	2012	17,643	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	54.40
City resolution	Petaluma, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2016-004 N.C.S.	2016	57,941	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	75.20
City resolution	Pittsburg, CA	CA	Resolution No. 13-11920	2013	63,264	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.60
City resolution	Rio Vista, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2012-092	2012	7,390	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	74.40
City resolution	Rohnert Park, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2012-111	2012	40,971	3	3.60	1	4.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	57.60
City resolution	Ross, CA	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	20.40
City resolution	San Anselmo, CA	CA	Complete Streets Plan Appendix B:	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	20.40
City resolution	San Anselmo, CA	CA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	12,336	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	70.40
City resolution	San Bruno, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2012-	2012	41,114	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	64.80
City resolution	San Carlos, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2012-	2012	28,406	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	74.40
City resolution	Santa Clara, CA	CA	Resolution No. Bos 2012-436	2012	116,468	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	73.60
City resolution	Santa Rosa, CA	CA	Resolution No. 28727	2015	167,815	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	73.60
City resolution	Saratoga, CA	CA	Resolution	2012	29,926	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	80.80
City resolution	Sebastopol, CA	CA	Resolution No. 5891	2012	7,379	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.60
City resolution	Sonoma, CA	CA	Resolution NO. 43-2015	2015	10,648	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	77.60
City resolution	South San Francisco, CA	CA	Resolution	2012	63,632	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	80.00
City resolution	St. Helena, CA	CA	Resolution No. 2012-	2012	5,814	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	76.00
City resolution	Suisun City, CA	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	80.80
City resolution	Vallejo, CA	CA	Resolution No. 12-155 N.C.	2012	115,942	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	60.80
City resolution	Windsor, CA	CA	Resolution NO. 2976-13	2013	26,801	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	0	0.00	9.20
City resolution	Yountville, CA	CA	Resolution Number 3062-12	2012	2,933	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	60.80
City resolution	Golden, CO	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	29.20
City resolution	New Haven, CT	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	46.80
City resolution	West Hartford, CT	CT	Resolution Adopting a Complete Streets Policy	2015	63,268	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	94.40
City resolution	Bonita Springs, FL	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	65.60
City resolution	Cape Canaveral, FL	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	46.40
City resolution	Cape Coral, FL	FL	Resolution 124-15	2015	154,305	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	4	16.00	68.80
City resolution	Casselberry, FL	FL	Resolution 16-2902	2016	26,241	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	84.00
City resolution	Cocoa Beach, FL	FL	Resolution No. 2011-24	2011	11,231	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	63.20
City resolution	Cocoa, FL	FL	Resolution No. 2011-060	2011	17,140	5	6.00	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	48.80
City resolution	Fort Myers, FL	FL	Resolution	2011	62,298	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	36.40
City resolution	Longwood, FL	FL	Resolution 15-1376	2015	13,657	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	69.60
City resolution	Miami, FL	FL	Resolution No. 09-00274	2009	399,457	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	24.40
City resolution	Naples, FL	FL	Resolution 15-13719	2015	19,537	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	69.60
City resolution	Orange City, FL	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	47.60
City resolution	Punta Gorda, FL	FL	Resolution 3047-13	2013	16,641	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	68.40
City resolution	Rockledge, FL	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	44.40
City resolution	Satellite Beach, FL	FL	Resolution NO 948	2014	10,109	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	57.60
City resolution	St. Petersburg, FL	FL	Resolution 2015-40	2015	244,769	3	3.60	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	63.60
City resolution	Tampa, FL	FL	Resolution No. 2814	2012	335,709	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	35.60
City resolution	Titusville, FL	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	46.80
City resolution	Winter Park, FL	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	69.20
City resolution	Americus, GA	GA	Resolution Adopting a Complete Streets Policy	2016	17,041	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0						

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	Pleasant Hill, IA	IA	Resolution #030816-04	2016	8,785	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	60.80
City resolution	Sergeant Bluff, IA	IA	Resolution 16-08	2016	4,227	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	73.60
City resolution	Sioux City, IA	IA	Resolution No. 2014-0518	2014	82,684	3	3.60	2	8.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	3	2.40	0	0.00	5	4.00	1	4.00	48.80
City resolution	Sprint Lake, IA	IA	Resolution No. 2014-51	2014	4,840	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	75.20
City resolution	Windsor Heights, IA	IA	Resolution 15-0749	2015	4,860	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	82.40
City resolution	McCall, ID	ID	Resolution 11-20	2011	2,991	3	3.60	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	50.40
City resolution	Brookfield, IL	IL	Resolution 2016-1038	2016	18,978	5	6.00	3	12.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	72.80
City resolution	Carbondale, IL	IL	Resolution No. 2015-R-12	2015	25,902	3	3.60	2	8.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	44.80
City resolution	Forest Park, IL	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	57.20
City resolution	Glen Carbon, IL	IL	Resolution No. 2015-3	2015	12,934	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	34.40
City resolution	Hoffman Estates, IL	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	64.40
City resolution	Lakemoor, IL	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	88.80
City resolution	Lemont, IL	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	70.40
City resolution	Park Forest, IL	IL	Resolution	2015	21,975	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	92.80
City resolution	Riverdale, IL	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	56.40
City resolution	Skokie, IL	IL	16-3-R-1320	2016	64,784	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	76.00
City resolution	South Chicago Heights, IL	IL	Resolution NO. 2016-R-2	2016	4,199	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	83.20
City resolution	Steger, IL	IL	Resolution No. 1096	2016	9,570	5	6.00	3	12.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	46.80
City resolution	Willow Springs, IL	IL	Resolution No. 2016-R-01	2016	5,524	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	82.40
City resolution	Fort Wayne, IN	IN	Resolution #103-11-2-16-2	2016	253,691	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	72.40
City resolution	Frankfort, IN	IN	Resolution 12-07	2012	16,422	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	53.60
City resolution	South Bend, IN	IN	Resolution 69-2015	2015	101,168	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	92.80
City resolution	Kansas City, KS	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	62.80
City resolution	Leawood, KS	KS	Resolution No. 3592	2011	31,867	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	50.80
City resolution	Overland Park, KS	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	47.60
City resolution	Roseland Park, KS	KS	Resolution No. 611	2011	6,731	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	1	4.00	13.20
City resolution	Topeka, KS	KS	Resolution	2009	127,473	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	0	0.00	24.40
City resolution	Wichita, KS	KS	Resolution No. 14-341	2014	382,368	3	3.60	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	31.60
City resolution	Corinth, KY	KY	Resolution No. 002-2014	2014	232	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	80.00
City resolution	Dry Ridge, KY	KY	Resolution No. 2015-01	2015	2,191	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	76.00
City resolution	Williamstown, KY	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	56.00
City resolution	St. Bernard Parish, LA	LA	Resolution SBPC #1572-04-16	2016	35,897	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	62.40
City resolution	Agawam, MA	MA	Resolution 2016-12	2016	28,438	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	5	20.00	90.40
City resolution	Everett, MA	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	69.60
City resolution	Maynard, MA	MA	Complete Streets Resolution	2013	10,166	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	71.20
City resolution	Anne Arundel, MD	MD	Resolution No. 6-14	2014	537,656	1	1.20	3	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	23.20
City resolution	Baltimore, MD	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	58.00
City resolution	Frederick, MD	MD	Resolution No. 16-11	2016	65,239	3	3.60	5	20.00	2	4.80	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	48.00
City resolution	Salisbury, MD	MD	Resolution No. 2431	2014	30,343	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	2	8.00	71.20
City resolution	Portland, ME	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	25.20
City resolution	Acme Township, MI	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	17.20
City resolution	Allegan, MI	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	21.20
City resolution	Allen Park, MI	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	41.20
City resolution	Alma, MI	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	21.20
City resolution	Ann Arbor, MI	MI	Resolution R-11-088	2011	113,934	3	3.60	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	28.80
City resolution	Atlas Township, MI	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	41.20
City resolution	Berkley, MI	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	21.20
City resolution	Berrien Springs, MI	MI	Resolution	2011	1,800	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.									



Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	Marquette Township, MI	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	17.20
City resolution	Midleville, MI	MI	Resolution 15-11	2015	3,319	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	68.00
City resolution	Milford Township, MI	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	46.00
City resolution	Mundy Charter Township, MI	MI	Resolution No. 10-13	2010	15,082	1	1.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.20
City resolution	Munising, MI	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	17.20
City resolution	Newberry, MI	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	17.20
City resolution	North Muskegon, MI	MI	Resolution 2013-137	2013	3,786	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	21.20
City resolution	Northville, MI	MI	Complete Streets Resolution	2011	5,970	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	25.20
City resolution	Norton Shores, MI	MI	Resolution	2013	23,994	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	24.40
City resolution	Novi, MI	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	0	0.00	21.20
City resolution	Oakland Charter Township, MI	MI	Resolution No. 11-04	2011	16,779	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	25.20
City resolution	Otsego, MI	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	17.20
City resolution	Owosso, MI	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	21.20
City resolution	Oxford, MI	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	17.20
City resolution	Pellston, MI	MI	Resolution	2011	822	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	17.20
City resolution	Pere Marquette, MI	MI	Resolution	2011	2,366	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	17.20
City resolution	Portage, MI	MI	Resolution of the Portage City Council in Support of the Complete Streets Policy	2015	46,292	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	4	16.00	84.80
City resolution	Roosevelt Park, MI	MI	Resolution 13-006	2013	3,831	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	17.20
City resolution	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	MI	Resolution	2010	14,144	1	1.20	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22.40
City resolution	Sterling Heights, MI	MI	Resolution	2012	129,699	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	17.20
City resolution	Suttons Bay, MI	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	21.20
City resolution	Traverse City, MI	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	29.20
City resolution	Union Charter Township, MI	MI	Resolution	2011	12,927	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	17.20
City resolution	Walker, MI	MI	Resolution #13-281	2013	23,537	5	6.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	30.00
City resolution	Warren, MI	MI	Resolution	2012	134,056	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	17.20
City resolution	Wayland, MI	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	0	0.00	21.20
City resolution	Woodhaven, MI	MI	Resolution	2011	12,875	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	17.20
City resolution	Battle Lake, MN	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	74.40
City resolution	Breckenridge, MN	MN	Resolution No. 12092-42/2011	2011	3,396	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	69.60
City resolution	Byron, MN	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	66.40
City resolution	Dilworth, MN	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	56.80
City resolution	Duluth, MN	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	28.40
City resolution	Fergus Falls, MN	MN	Resolution No. 141-2012	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	62.40
City resolution	Frazee, MN	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	62.40
City resolution	Golden Valley, MN	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	21.60
City resolution	Hawley, MN	MN	Resolution 16-66	2016	474	1	1.20	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	57.60
City resolution	Independence, MN	MN	Resolution No. 10-0413-03	2010	3,504	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	1	4.00	37.20
City resolution	New Hope, MN	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	43.20
City resolution	Northfield, MN	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	83.20
City resolution	Ottertail, MN	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	66.40
City resolution	Parkers Prairie, MN	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	66.40
City resolution	Pipestone, MN	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	74.40
City resolution	Red Wing, MN	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	69.20
City resolution	St. Cloud, MN	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	74.40
City resolution	St. Paul, MN	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	32.40
City resolution	Stewartville, MN	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	66.40
City resolution	Worthington, MN	MN	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	66.40
City resolution	Belton, MO	MO	Resolution R2012-03	2012	23,116	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	54.00
City resolution	Blue Springs, MO	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	62.00
City resolution	Esberry, MO	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	42.40
City resolution	Grandview, MO	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	64.40
City resolution	Independence, MO	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	41.20
City resolution	Kansas City, MO	MO	Resolution No. 110069	2011	459,787	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	0	0.00	9.20
City resolution	University City, MO	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	63.20
City resolution	Columbus, MS	MS	Resolution	2010	23,640	5	6.00	4																		

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	Bellevue, NE	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	78.00
City resolution	Keene, NH	NH	R-2011-28	2011	23,409	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	28.40
City resolution	Keene, NH	NH	Resolution 2015-40	2015	23,409	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	70.80
City resolution	Asbury Park, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2015-358	2015	16,116	3	3.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	32.80
City resolution	Atlantic City, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 917	2012	39,558	3	3.60	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	51.60
City resolution	Bay Head, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 2016-27	2016	968	3	3.60	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	33.20
City resolution	Bedminster Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2012-097	2012	8,165	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	23.60
City resolution	Bergenfield, Borough of, NJ	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	19.60
City resolution	Bloomfield, NJ	NJ	2011 Resolution - Establishing a Complete Streets Policy	2011	47,315	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	35.20
City resolution	Bordentown Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution #2014-174-24	2014	11,367	3	3.60	3	12.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	26.00
City resolution	Bound Brook, NJ	NJ	Resolution 15-102	2015	10,402	3	3.60	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	22.80
City resolution	Brigantine, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2013-120	2013	9,450	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	58.00
City resolution	Buena Borough, NJ	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	20.80
City resolution	Burlington, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 248-2016	2016	9,920	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	48.40
City resolution	Caldwell, NJ	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	73.60
City resolution	Calton, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2012	1,076	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	51.60
City resolution	Camden, NJ	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	74.40
City resolution	Cape May, NJ	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	58.80
City resolution	Chatham Borough, NJ	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	70.40
City resolution	Chester Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2013-58	2013	7,838	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	23.60
City resolution	Cranford Township, NJ	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	60.00
City resolution	Denville, NJ	NJ	Resolution 10-239	2010	16,635	1	1.20	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	25.20
City resolution	Dover, NJ	NJ	Resolution 092-2012	2012	18,157	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	1	4.00	52.00
City resolution	Downe Township, NJ	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	58.00
City resolution	East Amwell, NJ	NJ	Resolution 52-15	2015	4,013	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	33.60
City resolution	East Orange, NJ	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	55.20
City resolution	East Windsor, NJ	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	34.80
City resolution	Egg Harbor City, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 177-2012	2012	4,243	3	3.60	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	30.00
City resolution	Emerson, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2010	7,401	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	38.80
City resolution	Ewing Township, NJ	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	39.60
City resolution	Fair Haven, NJ	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	48.80
City resolution	Fanwood, Borough of, NJ	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	72.40
City resolution	Far Hills, NJ	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	30.40
City resolution	Flemington, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2013-181	2013	4,581	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	50.80
City resolution	Fort Lee, Borough of, NJ	NJ	Resolution CN-6	2012	35,345	1	1.20	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	24.40
City resolution	Franklin, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2014-61	2014	16,820	3	3.60	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	38.40
City resolution	Freehold Borough, NJ	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	46.00
City resolution	Frenchtown, NJ	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	19.60
City resolution	Garfield, NJ	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	44.40
City resolution	Gibbsboro, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2016-5-81	2016	2,274	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	64.00
City resolution	Glassboro Borough, NJ	NJ	Resolution 146-12	2012	18,579	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	48.80
City resolution	Glen Ridge, NJ	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	19.60
City resolution	Gloucester Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution R-12-07-155	2012	64,634	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	0	0.00	24.40
City resolution	Hackensack, NJ	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	19.60
City resolution	Hackettstown, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2012	9,724	5	6.00	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14.00
City resolution	Haddon Heights, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2014-193	2014	7,473	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	1	4.00	51.60
City resolution	Hamilton, NJ	NJ	Resolution 15-024	2015	26,503	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	26.80
City resolution	Hammonton, NJ	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									

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	Netcong, NJ	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	60.00
City resolution	New Milford, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2014:152	2014	16,941	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	13.20
City resolution	New Providence, NJ	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	42.00
City resolution	Newark, NJ	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	45.60
City resolution	North Wildwood, NJ	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	19.60
City resolution	Northfield, NJ	NJ	Resolution 182-2015	2015	8,624	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	38.00
City resolution	Northvale, NJ	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	22.00
City resolution	Ocean City, NJ	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	44.80
City resolution	Orange Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution 204-2011	2011	30,134	1	1.20	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	16.40
City resolution	Pemberton Township, NJ	NJ	Complete Streets Resolution No.##-2016	2016	27,912	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	55.20
City resolution	Pennington, Borough of, NJ	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	19.20
City resolution	Perth Amboy, NJ	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	25.20
City resolution	Plainsboro Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution 13-223	2013	22,999	1	1.20	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	22.80
City resolution	Pleasantville, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2011	20,249	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	1	4.00	35.60
City resolution	Point Pleasant Beach, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2013-0730/1A	2013	4,665	1	1.20	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	22.80
City resolution	Princeton, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2012	28,572	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	37.20
City resolution	Randolph Township, NJ	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	31.60
City resolution	Raritan, Borough of, NJ	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	29.20
City resolution	Raritan, Township of, NJ	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	48.80
City resolution	Red Bank, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 10-195	2010	12,206	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	52.00
City resolution	Ridgewood, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2011	24,958	1	1.20	2	8.00	0	0.00	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	15.60
City resolution	River Edge, NJ	NJ	Resolution 12-241	2012	11,340	1	1.20	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	24.40
City resolution	Robbinsville, NJ	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	30.40
City resolution	Roselle, NJ	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	34.00
City resolution	Rutherford, Borough of, NJ	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	28.40
City resolution	Sea Bright, Borough of, NJ	NJ	Resolution 208-2013	2013	1,412	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	1	4.00	36.80
City resolution	Scarsdale, NJ	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	47.20
City resolution	Somers Point, NJ	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	30.80
City resolution	Somerville, NJ	NJ	Resolution 15-0908-316	2015	12,098	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	17.20
City resolution	South Brunswick, NJ	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	31.60
City resolution	Tenafly, NJ	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	42.00
City resolution	Tom's River, NJ	NJ	Resolution	2012	91,239	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	37.20
City resolution	Trenton, NJ	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	78.40
City resolution	Union City, NJ	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	32.40
City resolution	Vineland, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 90-16	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	25.60
City resolution	Voorhees Township, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 90-16	2016	29,131	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	64.00
City resolution	West Orange Township, NJ	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	31.20
City resolution	West Windsor, NJ	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	35.20
City resolution	Westfield, NJ	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	27.60
City resolution	Westhampton, NJ	NJ	Resolution No. 101-12	2012	8,813	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	48.80
City resolution	Wildwood, NJ	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	47.60
City resolution	Winslow, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2016-387	2016	39,499	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	64.00
City resolution	Woodbine, NJ	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	19.60
City resolution	Woodbury, NJ	NJ	Resolution 12-200	2012	10,174	1	1.20	1	4.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	36.40
City resolution	Woodstown, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2016-44	2016	3,505	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	52.00
City resolution	Woolwich, NJ	NJ	Resolution R-2013-148	2013	10,200	1	1.20	1	4.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	15.60
City resolution	Mesilla, NM	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	48.40
City resolution	Altona, NY	NY	Resolution #83	2016	2,887	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00					

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	New Rochelle, NY	NY	Resolution	2012	77,062	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	3	9.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	49.20
City resolution	Rye, City of, NY	NY	Resolution No. 19/2014	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	68.00
City resolution	Saugerties, NY	NY	Resolution No. 19/2014	2014	3,971	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	75.60
City resolution	Sleepy Hollow, NY	NY	Resolution	2016	9,870	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	40.40
City resolution	Sodus Point, NY	NY	Complete Streets Policy Resolution	2015	900	1	1.20	3	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	13.20
City resolution	Ticonderoga, NY	NY	Resolution #158-2016	2016	5,042	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	21.20
City resolution	Troy, NY	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	33.20
City resolution	Valley Stream, NY	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	18.80
City resolution	Village of Fort Edward, NY	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	39.60
City resolution	Wawarsing, NY	NY	Resolution #63	2014	13,157	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	75.60
City resolution	White Plains, NY	NY	Resolution	2013	56,853	5	6.00	5	20.00	0	0.00	1	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	1	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	37.20
City resolution	Bowling Green, OH	OH	Resolution No. 3594	2015	30,028	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22.80
City resolution	Columbus, OH	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	29.20
City resolution	Hilliard, OH	OH	Resolution 12-R-14	2012	28,435	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	52.80
City resolution	Lima, OH	OH	Resolution 05-16	2016	38,771	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	0	0.00	68.80
City resolution	Newark, OH	OH	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	26.00
City resolution	Upper Arlington, OH	OH	Complete Streets Policy	2014	33,771	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.20
City resolution	Westerville, OH	OH	Resolution No. 2012-12	2012	36,120	1	1.20	5	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	24.80
City resolution	Collinsville, OK	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	46.80
City resolution	Edmond, OK	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	29.20
City resolution	Guthrie, OK	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	27.60
City resolution	Lawton, OK	OK	Resolution	2011	96,867	3	3.60	4	16.00	3	7.20	5	16.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	50.80
City resolution	Owasso, OK	OK	Resolution No. 2015-03	2015	28,915	3	3.60	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	23.60
City resolution	Phyror Creek, OK	OK	Resolution No. 2014-2	2014	9,539	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	56.00
City resolution	Sand Springs, OK	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	46.80
City resolution	Tulsa, OK	OK	Resolution	2012	391,906	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	53.20
City resolution	Newport, OR	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	28.40
City resolution	Franklin, PA	PA	Resolution No. 18 of 2010	2010	6,545	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	51.20
City resolution	Lancaster, PA	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	33.20
City resolution	Pittsburgh, PA	PA	A Resolution Adopting the City of Pittsburgh Complete Streets Policy	2016	305,704	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	5	20.00	92.80
City resolution	Middletown, RI	RI	Resolution	2011	16,150	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	17.20
City resolution	Newport, RI	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	32.40
City resolution	North Smithfield, RI	RI	Resolution	2012	11,967	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	17.20
City resolution	Pawtucket, RI	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	21.20
City resolution	Portsmouth, RI	RI	Resolution No. 2011-04-11A	2011	17,389	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	17.20
City resolution	Providence, RI	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	21.20
City resolution	South Kingstown, RI	RI	Resolution	2011	30,639	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	17.20
City resolution	Woonsocket, RI	RI	Resolution	2011	41,186	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	17.20
City resolution	Anderson, SC	SC	Resolution to Endorse and Support a Complete Streets Policy	2009	26,886	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	37.20
City resolution	Camden, SC	SC	Resolution	2011	6,838	5	6.00	2	8.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	36.40
City resolution	Columbia, SC	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	27.60
City resolution	Greenville, SC	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	27.60
City resolution	Greenwood, SC	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	27.60
City resolution	Myrtle Beach, SC	SC	Complete Streets Policy	2015	27,109	1	1.20	5	20.00	3	7.20	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	65.60
City resolution	Ninety-Six, SC	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	20.40
City resolution	Spartanburg, SC	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	6.00
City resolution	Sioux Falls, SD	SD	Resolution No. 53-15	2015	153,888	5	6.00	3	12.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	48.40
City resolution	East Ridge, TN	TN	Resolution No. 2456	2015	20,979	1	1.20	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	44.80
City resolution	Kingsport, TN	TN	Resolution	2011	48,205	1	1.20	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	25.20
City resolution	Knoxville, TN	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	34.80
City resolution	Austin, TX	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	29.20
City resolution	Brownsville, TX	TX	Resolution No. 2012-056	2012	175,023	3	3.60	4	16.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	48.80
City resolution	Dallas, TX	TX	Resolution 16-0173	2016	2,368,139	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	0	0.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	81.20
City resolution	Charlottesville, VA	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	39.60
City resolution	Battle Ground, WA	WA	Resolution No. 15-04	2015	17,571	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00															

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City resolution	Morgantown, WV	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	29.20
City tax ordinance	Seattle, WA	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	56.80
City executive order	Hartford, CT	CT	Streets and Sidewalks - Of the Hartford	2016	124,755	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	91.20
City executive order	Independence, KY	KY	Municipal Order No. 2015-MO-03	2015	24,757	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	76.00
City executive order	Taylor Mill, KY	KY	Municipal Order No. 63 Executive Order, Complete Streets Policy	2015	6,604	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	76.00
City executive order	Fitchburg, MA	MA	Policy	2016	40318	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	5	20.00	88.00
City executive order	Lincoln, NE	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	43.60
City executive order	Philadelphia, PA	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	33.20
City executive order	Reading, PA	PA	Executive Order 2-2015	2015	88,082	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	100.00
City executive order	Memphis, TN	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	57.60
City executive order	Houston, TX	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	51.60
City executive order	Salt Lake City, UT	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	35.60
City internal policy	Denver, CO	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	52.40
City internal policy	Canton, IL	IL	Complete Streets Proclamation	2013	14,704	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	21.20
City internal policy	Chicago, IL	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	39.60
City internal policy	North Chicago, IL	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	58.40
City internal policy	Midland, MI	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	24.40
City internal policy	Dover, NH	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	77.20
City internal policy	New Brunswick, NJ	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	57.60
City internal policy	Virginia Beach, VA	VA	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	62.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Hot Springs, AR	AR	Complete Streets Policy	2015	35,193	3	3.60	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	81.60
City policy adopted by elected board	North Little Rock, AR	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	38.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Mesa, AZ	AZ	Complete Streets Policy	2014	439,041	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	70.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Alameda, CA	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	69.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Albany, CA	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	64.00
City policy adopted by elected board	American Canyon, CA	CA	Resolution 2012-72	2012	19,454	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	75.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Azusa, CA	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	76.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Baldwin Park, CA	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	88.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Berkeley, CA	CA	Resolution 65.978-N.S.	2012	112,590	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	79.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Dublin, CA	CA	Resolution No. 199-12	2012	46,036	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	72.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Emeryville, CA	CA	Resolution No. 13-03	2013	10,980	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	76.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Hayward, CA	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	80.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Hermosa Beach, CA	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	88.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Huntington Park, CA	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	88.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Larkspur, CA	CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	11,926	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	2	3.20	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	71.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Livermore, CA	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	80.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Los Altos Hills, CA	CA	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	60.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Newark, CA	CA	Resolution 10074	2013	42,573	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	1	4.00	72.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Oakland, CA	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	81.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Ojai, CA	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	60.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Pacific, CA	CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	37,234	1	1.20	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	67.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Piedmont, CA	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	69.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Pleasant Hill, CA	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	68.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Pleasanton, CA	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	84.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Redding, CA	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	70.00
City policy adopted by elected board	San Leandro, CA	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	64.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Union City, CA	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	64.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Vacaville, CA	CA	Complete Streets Policy	2012	92,428	1	1.20	4																		

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City policy adopted by elected board	Dunwoody, GA	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	52.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Gainesville, GA	GA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	n/a	3	3.60	0	0.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	46.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Gainesville, GA	GA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	33,804	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	45.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Roswell, GA	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	58.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Savannah, GA	GA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	136,296	1	1.20	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	57.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Suwanee, GA	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	55.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Woodstock, GA	GA	Complete Streets Policy, No. 700-0005	2015	23,896	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	1	4.00	59.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Cascade, IA	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	35.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Des Moines, IA	IA	Complete Streets Policy	2008	203,433	5	6.00	4	16.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	39.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Harlan, IA	IA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	5,106	3	3.60	5	20.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	5	2.00	3	4.80	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	78.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Iowa City, IA	IA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	67,862	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	1	4.00	80.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Mason City, IA	IA	Complete Streets Policy	2014	28,079	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	1	4.00	73.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Muscatine, IA	IA	Resolution 92610-1113	2013	22,878	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	79.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Spencer, IA	IA	Resolution No. 5116	2013	11,233	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	19.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Urbandale, IA	IA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	39,463	1	1.20	0	0.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	25.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Waterloo, IA	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	80.00
City policy adopted by elected board	West Des Moines, IA	IA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	56,609	1	1.20	0	0.00	3	7.20	1	3.20	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	21.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Coeur d'Alene, ID	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	51.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Sandpoint, ID	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	54.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Algonquin, IL	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	68.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Arlington Heights, IL	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	69.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Chicago Heights, IL	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	60.80
City policy adopted by elected board	DeKalb, IL	IL	Complete Streets Policy, Policy Number 02-01	2016	43,862	5	6.00	5	20.00	3	7.20	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	68.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Des Plaines, IL	IL	Complete Streets Policy	2011	58,364	5	6.00	4	16.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	4	16.00	74.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Evanston, IL	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	60.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Midlothian, IL	IL	Complete Streets Policy	2016	14,819	5	6.00	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	72.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Normal, IL	IL	Complete Streets Policy	2016	52,497	3	3.60	3	12.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	73.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Oak Lawn, IL	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	52.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Plainfield, IL	IL	Complete Streets Policy	2015	39,581	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	3	12.00	88.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Tinley Park, IL	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	60.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Village of Lombard, IL	IL	Village Board Policy 6.J.	2014	43,165	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	3	9.60	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	62.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Peru, IN	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	92.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Westfield, IN	IN	Resolution 12-114	2013	30,068	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	42.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Whitestown, IN	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	48.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Hutchinson, KS	KS	Complete Streets Policy	2012	42,080	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	70.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Iola, KS	KS	Complete Streets Policy	2016	5,704	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	69.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Lawrence, KS	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	60.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Grant County, KY	KY	Complete Streets Policy	2015	24,662	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	66.40
City policy adopted by elected board	Baton Rouge, LA	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	77.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Acton, MA	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	87.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Adams, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	8,485	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	88.80
City policy adopted by elected board	Arlington, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy and Guidelines	2016	42844	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	81.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Ashland, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	16,593	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	87.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Ayer, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	7427	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	5	20.00	95.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Barre, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	5398	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	81.60
City policy adopted by elected board	Bedford, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	13,320	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	80.00
City policy adopted by elected board	Beverly, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	39,502	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	3	12.00	83.20
City policy adopted by elected board	Bridgewater, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	26963	5	6.00	5																		



Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City policy adopted by elected board	Lancaster, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	8055	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	3	12.00	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Lenox, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	5,025	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	<b>92.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Leominster, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	40759	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Lexington, MA	MA	Complete Streets	2016	31394	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Littleton, MA	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	<b>90.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Lowell, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	106,519	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	<b>54.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Lynn, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	15,784	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	4	16.00	<b>84.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Malden, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	59,450	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Manchester-by-the-Sea, MA	MA	Establishing a Safe and Accessible Streets Policy	2016	5,136	5	6.00	5	20.00	0	0.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>80.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Mansfield, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	23184	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	<b>98.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Marlborough, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	38,499	3	3.60	2	8.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>78.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Maynard, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	10106	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	<b>90.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Medford, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	56,173	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	<b>88.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Melrose, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	26983	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Mendon, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	5839	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Merrimac, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	6338	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Middleton, MA	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Milville, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	3190	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	5	20.00	<b>94.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Nantucket, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	10172	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	<b>84.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Natick, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	30,510	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	New Bedford, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	95072	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	3	12.00	<b>88.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Newton, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	85,416	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	North Adams, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	13,708	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	4	16.00	<b>90.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	North Reading, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	14892	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>81.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Norwell, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	9,279	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Orange, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	7839	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	<b>90.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Oxford, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	13709	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Palmer, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	12140	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Peabody, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	51251	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Plymouth, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2013	56,468	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	<b>78.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Plymouth, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	56468	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	5	20.00	<b>94.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Reading, MA	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Rockland, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	17489	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Rutland, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	7973	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>85.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Salem, MA	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Salisbury, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	8283	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	<b>87.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Sandisfield, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	915	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	<b>92.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Schuote, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	18133	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Sherborn, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	4119	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	3	2.40	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	<b>98.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Shirley, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	7211	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	2	8.00	<b>82.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Shrewsbury, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	35,608	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>85.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Somerset, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	18165	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	5	20.00	<b>94.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	South Hadley, MA	MA	Complete Streets Administrative Policy for the town of South Hadley	2016	17514	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	5	20.00	<b>91.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Spencer, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	11688	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	<b>84.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Springfield, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2015	153060	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	5	20.00	<b>92.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Stoughton, MA	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	<b>86.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Stow, MA	MA	Complete Streets Policy	2016	6590	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.	

Type	Agency	State	Policy name	Year	Population	Intent		Users and modes		Projects		Exceptions		Connectivity		Jurisdiction		Flexibility		Context		Metrics		Implementation		Total score
						Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	Points	Weighted points	
City policy adopted by elected board	Big Lake, MN	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	<b>76.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Bloomington, MN	MN	Complete Streets Policy	2012	82,893	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	0	0.00	<b>72.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Brooklyn Center, MN	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	<b>78.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Falcon Heights, MN	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	<b>56.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Hopkins, MN	MN	Legislative Policy 8-I	2013	17,991	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	<b>77.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Hutchinson, MN	MN	Complete Streets Policy	2015	1,220	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	3	12.00	<b>72.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Independence, MN	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	<b>52.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Maple Plain, MN	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	<b>48.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Maplewood, MN	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>27.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Minneapolis, MN	MN	Complete Streets Policy	2016	382,578	5	6.00	5	20.00	2	4.80	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>85.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	New Hope, MN	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	<b>84.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	New Ulm, MN	MN	Complete Streets Policy	2016	13,522	3	3.60	4	16.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	<b>40.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Rochester, MN	MN	Complete Streets Policy	2009	106,769	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	<b>74.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Anderson, MO	MO	Livable Streets Policy	2016	1,961	3	3.60	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	<b>61.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Festus, MO	MO	Resolution No. 3924 1/2	2010	11,602	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	<b>75.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Lee's Summit, MO	MO	Resolution No. 10-17	2010	91,364	1	1.20	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	2	1.60	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	<b>72.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Springfield, MO	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	<b>68.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Billings, MT	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	<b>52.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Glendive, MT	MT	Safe and Accessible Streets Policy	2015	4,935	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	0	0.00	<b>65.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Hamilton, MT	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	<b>46.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Poison, MT	MT	Safe and Accessible Streets Policy	2015	4,488	3	3.60	3	12.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	3	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	<b>40.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Asheville, NC	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	<b>51.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Raleigh, NC	NC	Complete Streets Policy	2015	403,892	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	1	4.00	<b>56.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Omaha, NE	NE	Complete Streets Policy	2015	408,958	5	6.00	3	12.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	20.00	<b>88.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Concord, NH	NH	Comprehensive Transportation Policy	2010	42,895	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>27.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Hinsdale, NH	NH	Complete Streets Policy	2016	4,046	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	1	3.20	5	2.00	2	3.20	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	5	20.00	<b>78.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Portsmouth, NH	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	<b>82.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Swanzey, NH	NH	Complete Streets Policy	2015	7,230	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	3	12.00	<b>68.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Troy, NH	NH	Complete Streets Policy	2016	2,145	5	6.00	4	16.00	2	4.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	<b>40.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Cherry Hill Township, NJ	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	<b>65.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Elizabeth, NJ	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	<b>48.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Hillsborough, NJ	NJ	"Complete Streets Policy" for the	2014	38,303	1	1.20	4	16.00	3	7.20	4	12.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	2.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	<b>43.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Litwood, NJ	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>36.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Metuchen, Borough of, NJ	NJ	Resolution 2013-210	2013	13,574	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	2	8.00	<b>72.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Morristown, NJ	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	<b>53.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	South Orange, NJ	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	<b>49.60</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Summit, NJ	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	<b>66.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Woodbridge, NJ	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	<b>63.20</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Las Cruces, NM	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	<b>62.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Babylon, NY	NY	Complete Streets Policy	2010	12,166	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	2	6.40	5	2.00	2	3.20	3	2.40	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	<b>72.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Great Neck Plaza, NY	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	<b>64.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Lewisboro, NY	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	<b>56.80</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	North Hempstead, NY	NY	Complete Streets Policy Guide	2011	226,322	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	0	0.00	5	2.00	5	8.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	<b>72.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Saratoga Springs, NY	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	<b>64.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Silver Creek, NY	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	<b>66.40</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Dayton, OH	OH	Livable Streets Policy	2010	141,527	5	6.00	5	20.00	5	12.00	5	16.00	5	2.00	0	0.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	<b>72.00</b>
City policy adopted by elected board	Liberty Township, OH	OH	Complete Streets Policy	2014	21,982	1	1.20	4	16.00	5	12.00	4	12.80	5	2.00	2										

## Endnotes

---

- 1 Leinberger, C. and Rodriguez, M. (2016, June). *Foot Traffic Ahead 2016*. The George Washington University School of Business. Available at <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/foot-traffic-ahead-2016/>.
- 2 Hamblin, J. (2014, August 13). "Do We Look Fat in These Suburbs?" The Atlantic. Available at <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/08/blame-the-city/375888/>.
- 3 National Institute of Health. "Overweight & Obesity Statistics." Available at <https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/health-statistics/overweight-obesity>.
- 4 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016, June). "National Center for Health Statistics: Exercise or Physical Activity." Available at <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/exercise.htm>.
- 5 Smart Growth America. (2017, January). *Dangerous by Design 2016*. Available at <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design>.
- 6 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2016). "Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Encyclopedia." Retrieved on April 21, 2017 from <https://www-fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/Main/index.aspx>.
- 7 Smart Growth America. (2017, January). *Dangerous by Design 2016*. Available at <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design>.
- 8 New York, NY, Los Angeles, CA, Chicago, IL, Houston, TX, Philadelphia, PA, Phoenix, AZ, San Antonio, TX, San Diego, CA, Dallas, TX, Austin, TX, Jacksonville, FL, San Francisco, CA, Indianapolis, IN, Columbus, OH all have Complete Streets policies.
- 9 U.S. Census Bureau. "2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates." Retrieved June 7, 2017 from [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml?src=bkml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml?src=bkml).
- 10 Smart Growth America. (2017, January). *Dangerous by Design 2016*. Available at <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design/>.
- 11 Smart Growth America. (2017, January). *Dangerous by Design 2016*. Available at <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design/>.