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- BMC-MPO Complete Streets Policy
- Implementation Case Studies
Successful Complete Streets Policies
Specify all users
Encourage connectivity of network
Are applicable to all roads
Apply to new and retrofit projects
Provide for exceptions
Encourage best design standards
Complement community context
Establish performance standards
Identify steps for implementation
BMC-MPO Complete Streets Policy

Citizen Discord

Staff and Board Education (1 year)

Policy Refinement (1 year)

Complete Streets Policy adopted by Policy Committee January 2009
Users = peds, bikes, users of mass transit, people with disabilities, elderly, motorists, freight pirates, emergency responders, and adjacent land users.
Successful Complete Streets Policies
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Identify steps for implementation
# BMCMPO Complete Streets Policy

- **Process**
  - Call for Projects for TIP
  - Review by CAC & TAC
  - Policy Committee adopts projects as Complete Streets compliant by resolution
  - Regular reporting/project updates
    - Significant changes may warrant exception/recertification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2007</td>
<td>CD-ROM Complete Streets staff level training – subsequent discussions about developing a policy and compiling research/information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2007</td>
<td>CAC packet includes information packet on Complete Streets and is on the agenda as new business for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2007</td>
<td>TAC agenda item with information packet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/2007</td>
<td>CAC packet includes a supplemental information packet on Complete Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2007</td>
<td>PC/TAC – mention about webinar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2007</td>
<td>CAC agenda item for continued discussion. Staff presents an abbreviated presentation of the APA CD-ROM presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23/2008</td>
<td>CAC (not included in the packet) presents a first draft of a Complete Streets Policy (version 1) to further facilitate the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/2008</td>
<td>TAC agenda item with positive discussion and knowledge of CAC’s policy work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2008</td>
<td>Planning Department hosts a APA Webinar on Complete Streets (encore presentation) and invites staff as well as MPO committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2008</td>
<td>TAC draft policy (version 1) included in packet with concerns over design review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/2008</td>
<td>CAC packet includes a draft of the Complete Streets Policy (version 1), but no discussion ensued because of other action items on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28/2008</td>
<td>TAC agenda item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2008</td>
<td>CAC continued discussion and made a few suggestions to the draft, but again there were other action items on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/2008</td>
<td>CAC continued discussion and made a few suggestions to the draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23/2008</td>
<td>TAC agenda item under staff report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/2008</td>
<td>CAC packet included a revised draft of the Complete Streets Policy (version 2) and a good discussion transpired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2008</td>
<td>PC agenda item under CAC report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2008</td>
<td>CAC reached consensus with revisions and preliminarily adopted the policy up to section II and subsequently developed version 3 of the Complete Streets Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/2008</td>
<td>CAC chair and vice chair met with staff to review version 3 to the draft policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8/22/2008    TAC agenda item under staff report
8/27/2008    CAC packet includes draft Complete Streets Policy (version 3) and staff presents supplemental/revised
draft material from the 7/22/2008 meeting; which includes a new section on process where the CAC reached consensus and
preliminarily adopted up to the implementation (excluding the exemption) section and continued discussion on the remaining
sections (staff suggest the CAC preliminarily adopt the exemption section at the next meeting)
9/12/2008    PC agenda item under staff report and staff subsequently sent out the most current version 4 with out the
new sections on implementation and evaluation because the CAC had yet to review
9/24/2008    CAC packet includes draft Complete Streets Policy (version 4) with new material in the implementation and
evaluation sections the CAC adopts the whole policy for consideration by the TAC and PC
9/26/2008    TAC packet includes CAC adopted Complete Streets Policy (version 4)
Reconstructions – does not apply to resurfacing projects that do not alter the current geometry of the road
Local roadway projects = no State projects, trail projects, transit projects exempted
Any phase = PE, ROW, CON
Grandfather provision = any project already in the TIP and past 30% complete on design

**BMCMPO Complete Streets Policy**

- Exemptions
  - Ordinary maintenance
  - Users are prohibited
  - Extreme constraints
  - 20yr projections < 1000 ADT
  - No demonstrated need or equivalent already exists
Users = peds, bikes, users of mass transit, people with disabilities, elderly, motorists, freight pirates, emergency responders, and adjacent land users.
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Reconstructions – does not apply to resurfacing projects that do not alter the current geometry of the road

Local roadway projects = no State projects, trail projects, transit projects exempted

Any phase = PE, ROW, CON

Grandfather provision = any project already in the TIP and past 30% complete on design
Call for projects = detailed project description, intent to CS compliant, performance standards, performance standards, phases, funding requested, dates, public participation process, stakeholder list