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Complete Streets Defined

A Complete Street is one that provides safe and accessible options for all travel modes – walking, biking, transit and vehicles – for people of all ages and abilities.

Complete Streets improvements may be large scale such as corridor wide improvements or focused on the needs of a single mode.
CS Funding Program Objectives for FY16

- Provide technical assistance and incentives for adoption of Complete Streets policies at the municipal level so that a broader range of communities are encouraged to enter the program in order to be eligible for project funding in future years.

- Encourage municipalities to adopt a strategic and comprehensive approach to Complete Streets, rather than simply seeking funding for a single project, by providing technical assistance to communities to create Complete Streets prioritization plans.

- Facilitate better pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel for users of all ages and abilities by addressing critical gaps in pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure by funding Complete Streets projects in cities and towns that have already adopted policies and undertaken planning.

- In distributing FY16 funding, reward municipalities who have committed to adopting Complete Streets best practices through the Community Compact Cabinet while assuring underserved municipalities are served equitably by the program as stated in the statute.
CS Funding Program Snapshot

- Three Tiers for entry into the Program

- Planning Assistance – Up to $50,000 available to any community

- CS Construction – Up to $400,000 (Design is not an eligible expense)

- Eligible list of CS infrastructure will be provided

- Program ~ $12.5M to be spent over the next two years (2016-17).

- Full Program Guidance and Online Portal – Late January
A New Consideration: Community Compacts

- On January 23rd, 2015 Governor Baker signed his first Executive Order creating the Community Compact Cabinet, in order to elevate the Administration’s partnerships with cities and towns in the Commonwealth.

- A Community Compact is a voluntary, mutual agreement entered into between the Baker-Polito Administration and individual cities and towns of the Commonwealth; in a Community Compact, a community agrees to implement at least one best practice selected from across a variety of areas.

- Communities that sign a compact receive priority for specific Commonwealth technical assistance resources to help achieve the chosen best practice(s).

- Complete Streets are included as one of the listed best practices and to date 11 communities have selected this as their best practice commitment and this list keeps growing.

- The Community Compact program is administered by Mass. Dept. of Revenue’s Division of Local Services and more information can be found at http://www.mass.gov/governor/administration/groups/communitycompactcabinet/
CS Funding Program Framework

- Tier 1 – Complete Streets Policy Development
- Tier 2 – Complete Streets Prioritization Plan Development
- Tier 3 – Project Approval and Notice To Proceed for construction
CS Funding Program Framework

Tier 1 – Complete Streets Policy Development and Training

➢ Attend Training ~ A municipal representative is required to attend MassDOT Complete Streets 101 Training (offered through Bay State Roads starting in December). This will include a module on model policy development.

➢ Pass a CS Policy ~ Municipalities submit a Complete Streets Policy for scoring. The Policy will need to be approved by a chief elected official or board with one public meeting. If policy scores of 80/100 or above, advance to Tier 2.
# Cities and Towns with Policies in Place

## Complete Streets Local Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Enactment Date</th>
<th>Type of Measure</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acton*</td>
<td>7/28/14</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS/PB</td>
<td>22,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly*</td>
<td>3/9/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by CC</td>
<td>40,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Design Manual/Guide</td>
<td>636,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1992-2013</td>
<td>Exists in Multiple Plans</td>
<td>106,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett*</td>
<td>3/10/14</td>
<td>Resolution Approved by CC</td>
<td>42,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framingham*</td>
<td>1/6/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>70,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke*</td>
<td>12/16/14</td>
<td>City Ordinance</td>
<td>40,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton*</td>
<td>12/16/13</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>9,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Policy Approved by CC</td>
<td>108,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlboro</td>
<td>10/19/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by CC</td>
<td>39,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard*</td>
<td>11/5/13</td>
<td>Resolution Approved by BoS</td>
<td>10,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton*</td>
<td>11/18/14</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>8,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natick</td>
<td>3/23/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>33,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton*</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Transportation Plan</td>
<td>28,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwell</td>
<td>5/13/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>10,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading*</td>
<td>7/29/14</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>24,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>5/7/13</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS/PB</td>
<td>56,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem*</td>
<td>6/28/14</td>
<td>Policy Approved by CC</td>
<td>41,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville*</td>
<td>5/8/14</td>
<td>City Ordinance</td>
<td>75,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>9/28/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>11,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>10/6/15</td>
<td>Resolution Approved by CC</td>
<td>153,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton*</td>
<td>10/7/14</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>26,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>9/18/14</td>
<td>Departmental Administrative Policy</td>
<td>61,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>10/1/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by BoS</td>
<td>14,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>11/9/15</td>
<td>Policy Approved by PB</td>
<td>55,419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POPULATION TOTAL:** 1,770,016

(27% of state’s 6,547,629 residents)

*Cities in Bold*

---

* = listed on the Smart Growth America/National Complete Streets Coalition website

CC = City Council --- BoS = Town Board of Selectmen --- PB = Planning Board
Model Policy Development

• Ten Key Policy Elements

• MassDOT provides guidance on the policy elements that should be addressed in a policy, however allows for flexibility in the specific language and commitment level.

• Adopted policies are scored based on their stated level of commitment to aligning transportation infrastructure planning, design, construction and maintenance practices to CS principles.

• Policies are scored based 100 possible points and must achieve 80 points or above to be eligible for funding.
# Model Policy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible 100 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vision and Intent (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Users and Modes (20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Projects and Phases (15 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exceptions (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Practices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Network (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jurisdiction (5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Design Guidance (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Context Sensitive (5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Performance Measures (5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Implementation (10 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Model Policy – Ten Elements

1. Vision & Goals – What do you want your community to look like?
2. Users and Modes – Defining who the system serves
3. Projects and Phases – Design, construction, maintenance?
4. Exceptions – Where does the policy not apply?
5. Network – Data on gaps
6. Jurisdiction - Who does it apply to?
7. Context Sensitivity – One size does not fit all
8. Design Guidance – Committing to best practice
9. Performance Measures - How do you measure progress?
10. Implementation – Concrete steps to embed Complete Streets in procedures and practice
## Model Policy and Scoring

### Policy Element Scoring System Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Vision and intent Total Points: 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Indirect: Indirect statement (“shall implement Complete Streets principles,” etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Average: Direct statement with equivocating or weaker language (“consider,” “may”)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Direct: Direct statement of accommodation (“must,” “shall,” “will”)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No additional points available for this element.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. All users and modes Total Points: 20</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— “Bicyclists and pedestrians” (required for consideration)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— “Bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— “Bicyclists, pedestrians, transit,” plus one more mode</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— “Bicycles, pedestrians, transit,” plus two more modes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional points available - awarded independently of each other:* |
| — Including reference to “users of all ages” | 4 |
| — Including reference to “users of all abilities” |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. All projects and phases Total Points: 15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Applies to new construction only</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Applies to new and retrofit/reconstruction projects</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional points available:* |
| — Policy clearly applies to all projects, or specifically includes repair/3R projects, maintenance, and/or operations | 5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Exceptions Total Points: 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— No mention</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Lists exceptions, but at least one lacks clarity or allows loose interpretation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Lists exceptions, none are inappropriate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional points available:* |
| — Specifies an approval process | 6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Network Total Points: 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy does not reference networks or connectivity.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy simply acknowledges the importance of a network approach.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No additional points available for this element.*
Tier 2 – Develop a Complete Streets Prioritization Plan

- Seeks to have municipalities look holistically at CS needs, safety or network gaps, and develop hierarchy of funding priorities that align with local plans and roadway work.


- Indicate how/why priority (bike, pedestrian, transportation plans, crash data, HSIP crash cluster data, safety audits).

- Develop Schedule and Estimate (Timeline is flexible)
Tier 2 - Complete Streets Prioritization Plan

Municipalities enter Tier 2 if they have attended training and:

**Tier 2a**
- Have an eligible policy (>80), and
- Want to submit their CS Prioritization Plan for review

**Tier 2b**
- Have an eligible policy (>80), and
- Want to request Technical Assistance (up to $50k) to develop the CS Prioritization Plan

**Tier 2c**
- Commit to adopting a policy (through letter of commitment to MassDOT) and developing a CS Prioritization Plan.
- Want to request Technical Assistance (up to $50k) to develop the CS Prioritization Plan
Tier 3 - Project Approval and Notice To Proceed

- Municipality identifies projects from its priority plan for funding. A simple application (online) will be filled out capturing information from all three Tiers.

- Municipality enters into a contract with MassDOT for reimbursement of funds. This should happen during Tier 2 if municipalities are seeking TA funding.

- The municipality and appropriate District State Aid office will be notified of approved projects. Municipality will then enter the Chapter 90 process.

- For year 1, funding can range up to $400,00. No minimum.
### Eligible Infrastructure Examples

#### Traffic & Safety
- Street Lighting
- Addition of or widening of shoulders
- Roundabouts
- Road diets
- Speed attenuation devices
- Intersection reconstruction – reducing complexity and crossing distance
- Intersection signalization (major updates/upgrades & New Installation)
- Pavement markings or signage that provides a separate accommodation for alternative modes
- Removal of protruding objects (pedestrian path of travel, bicycle, vehicular or transit facility)
- Pedestrian Signal & Timing (minor updates)
- Changing pedestrian signal timing (i.e., lead pedestrian interval)
- Traffic calming measures
- Radar speed feedback (“Your Speed”) signs
- Reducing corner radii
- Additional regulatory signing (for existing regulations)
- Speed humps
- Curbing

#### Bicycle Facilities
- New shared use paths
- Elimination of hazardous conditions on shared use paths
- Designated bicycle lanes
- Designated Separated Bike Lane
- Advance stop facilities (bike box)
- Bicycle parking at transit and other locations
- On-street bicycle parking
- Provide bicycle-safe drain grates and other hardware
- Bicycle boulevards
- Improvement of shared use paths (non-safety related)
- Bicycle wayfinding signs
- Shared lanes (sharrows)
- Bike route signs

#### Pedestrian Facilities
- Providing new sidewalks
- Sidewalk Repairs (tree roots, uplifted panels, etc.)
- Providing ADA/AAB compliant curb ramps
- Providing pedestrian buffer zones
- Providing medians with ADA/AAB-compliant design
- Pedestrian Refuge Islands
- Curb extensions at pedestrian crossings
- Crosswalks
- Widening existing sidewalks
- Accessible pedestrian signals
- Detectable Warning Surfaces
- New or improved crossing treatments at intersections, midblock, etc.
- New pedestrian accommodations at traffic signals
- Pedestrian wayfinding signs
- Interim public plazas
- Traffic re-routing to create pedestrian zones

#### Transit Facilities
- Improving transit connections for pedestrians, including: ramps, providing and/or moving crosswalks, signing
- Transit signal prioritization
- Bus pull-out areas
- Railroad grade crossings improvements (signs, flange way fill, etc.)
- Transit-only lanes
- Transit contra-flow lanes
- Improving transit connections for pedestrians, including: ramps, providing and/or moving crosswalks, signing
- Transit shelter

---

Project Types
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Complete Streets Project Examples
Swampscott – Stanley School Safe Routes to School Project

Cost:
-Curb/Sidewalk – $20K
-Curb Ramp – $10K
-Striping/Signage – $2K
-Landscaping - $1K
Total Investment - $33K

Complete Streets Benefits:
-High Visibility Crosswalk
-Shorter Crossing Distance
-ADA Compliant Curb Ramps
-Improved alignment of intersection for improved visibility
-Landscaping Features
Complete Streets Improvements Safety Benefits

Sidewalks reduce pedestrian crashes 88% (FHWA)
Shoulders reduce pedestrian crashes 71% (FDOT)
Medians reduce crashes 40% (NCHRP)
Road diets reduce crashes 18 – 49% (ITE)
Countdown signals reduce crashes 25% (FHWA)
Complete Streets Improvements Health Benefits

• The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified adoption of Complete Streets policies as a recommended strategy to prevent obesity.

• Massachusetts Department of Public Health in Partnership with Community of Practice (CoP) members stated “Complete Streets policies encourage the creation and operation of road networks that support physical activity…Physical activity is associated with decreased obesity and reduced risk for several chronic diseases, including arthritis and heart disease.”

Pucher, “Walking and Cycling: Path to Improved Public Health,” Fit City Conference, NYC, June 2009
Complete Streets Improvements Health Benefits

Benefits for Children in Massachusetts

- 14.5% of 10- to 17-year-olds are obese (2011).
- 10.2% High School students are obese (2013).
- Limited physical activity contributes to the obesity epidemic among children.
- Streets that provide dedicated space for bicycling and walking help kids be physically active and gain independence.

Our aging population

- In Massachusetts the population aged 65 and over is estimated to increase by over half a million (548,699) by 2030.
- Increasing from 14% of the state’s total population in 2010 to 21% by 2030.
- About ½ of all non-drivers over the age of 65 would like to get out more often.
- “To accommodate the mobility needs of an aging population, the focus of transportation planning and policy must shift from increasing road capacity to providing more multi-modal solutions. Investments are needed in Complete Streets, …” AARP
Complete Streets Program Preliminary Timeline

- Complete Streets Training (to include Policy Building Training)  
  December 2015 thru March 2016

- Final Program Guidance and Application Materials  
  late January 2016

- Municipality submits Complete Streets Policy  
  February thru June 2016

- Tier 1 Policy Review and Scoring  
  February thru June 2016

- Tier 2 CS Prioritization and Spending Plan Deadline  
  early June 2016

- Tier 3 Project Review and Approval  
  end of June 2016

- Enter into Contract with MassDOT and Begin CH90 Process through District Office  
  early July 2016

- Projects under Tier 3 receive NTP (FY17)  
  July 2016

- Evaluate Program Performance Consider Second Round for municipalities that passed Policies and Prioritization Plans after end of June depending on remaining funds  
  July 2016