Complete Streets Checklist

Implementation of MTC's Complete Streets Policy, Resolution 4493, Adopted 3/25/22

Background

Since 2006, MTC's Complete Streets (CS) Policy has promoted the planning, design, and construction of transportation facilities that provide safe mobility and comfortable connectivity for all users, and particularly for people walking, rolling, and biking. MTC updated its CS Policy in March 2022 to align with the safety, equity, and mode shift goals of Plan Bay Area 2050 (PBA2050), the region's long range Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. In particular, the updated CS Policy serves to guide implementation of two PBA2050 strategies - T8, to develop a Complete Streets Network, enhancing streets to promote walking, biking, and other micromobility options through sidewalk improvements, car-free slow streets, and 10,000 miles of bike lanes or multi-use paths, and T9 – advancing regional Vision Zero policy through street design and reduced speeds.

Complete Streets are planned, designed, constructed, reconstructed, operated, and maintained to be safe and comfortable for everyone, regardless of age, ability, ethnicity, race, sex, income, disability or chosen transportation mode. Complete Streets provide safe mobility and improved connectivity to community destinations for all users, and especially for people walking, rolling, biking and riding transit, while maximizing the use of the existing public right-of-way by prioritizing space-efficient forms of mobility (walking, cycling, shared mobility and public transit) over space intensive modes (single occupancy auto travel).

MTC's updated CS Policy (Resolution 4493) requires that all projects with a total project cost of \$250,000 or more applying for discretionary transportation funding from MTC submit a Complete Streets Checklist to ensure that integrated planning and design enable full implementation of adopted bicycle/pedestrian plans and safety improvements - to the maximum extent feasible - as part of every project affecting the physical or operational state of transportation facilities and public rights-of-way, including during construction and other temporary ROW closures. The Policy also extends to projects requesting MTC endorsements and Letters of Support for state or federal funding programs.

Completed Checklists must be reviewed by local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (or equivalent) and submitted to MTC with funding applications, or their equivalent.

Any project seeking an exemption to the CS Policy must provide documentation in the Complete Streets Checklist detailing how the project meets one or more of the allowable exception conditions. Exceptions must be documented and signed by the agency's Director of Public Works, Transportation Department (or equivalent), or their designee.

Checklist submittal for projects with a total project cost below \$250,000 is optional.

Instructions:

This form may be helpful for preparing responses, but please note that this Checklist <u>must</u> <u>be submitted online</u> at https://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov.

| PROJECT INFORMATION | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Project Name/Title: | | | | | | |
| Date Submitted: | | | | | | |
| Project Area/Location(s): | Project Area/Location(s): | | | | | |
| PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (300-word limit) | | | | | | |
| Project Phase Pull Down N | fenu: Planning, PE, ENV, R | OW, CON, O&M | | | | |
| May provide links to additional project details, grant applications, or other documents. | | | | | | |
| CONTACT INFORMATION | | | | | | |
| Contact Name & Title: | Contact Email: | | Contact Phone: | | | |
| Agency: | | | | | | |

| Торіс | CS Policy Consideration | YES | NO | Required Description |
|---|---|-----|----|---|
| Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Planning | Is the project consistent with relevant Plans or other adopted policies? Examples include: • City/County General + Area Plan • Bicycle, Pedestrian & Transit Plan • Community Based Transportation Plan • ADA Transition Plan • Station Access Plan • Short-Range Transit Plan • Vision Zero/Systematic Safety Plan | | | Please list relevant Plans, relevant Plan language, adoption date. If project is not consistent, please explain. |
| Active Transportation Network | Does the project area contain segments of the regional Active Transportation Network? | | | If Yes, describe how project adheres to the All |

| Topic | CS Policy Consideration | YES | NO | Required Description |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----|----|--|
| | [See AT Network map at mtc.ATNetwork.gov- placeholders] | | | Ages and Abilities design principles. See Attachment 1 |
| Safety and Comfort | Is the Project on a known High Injury Network or has a local traffic safety analysis ⁱ found a high incidence of bicyclist/pedestrian crashes within the project area? May use Bay Area Vision Zero (<i>mtc.BAYVIZ.gov placeholder</i>) | | | Please describe the Systemic Safety Analysis Report, Vision Zero Action Plan, High Injury Network, or other analysis of the project area. List the project's traffic safety measures. |
| | If project includes a Bikeway, was any Suitability, Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), or similar user experience analyses conducted? | | | Describe how project seeks to provide a suitable facility and/or reduce facility's LTS. |
| Transit ¹ Coordination | Are there existing public transit facilities (stop or station) abutting the project ROW? | | | List transit facility(ies) and all affected agencies. |
| | Have all potentially affected transit agencies had the opportunity to review this project? | | | Summarize agency contact(s) and comments. |
| | Is there a Mobility Hub within the project area? <u>https://mtc.ca.gov/planning/transp ortation/mobility-hubs/universe- bay-area-mobility-hubs</u> | | | If Yes, please describe improvements and coordination efforts with all affected mobility providers, incl. bike share, scooters, car share. |

| Topic | CS Policy Consideration | YES | NO | Required Description |
|-----------------------------|---|-----|----|---|
| Design | Does the project meet professional design standards ⁱⁱ or guidelines appropriate for bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities? | | | Please provide Class designation for bikeways. Cite design standards used. |
| Measuring Performance | Does your agency have plans or programs to track the impact of the project over time? | | | Please submit bike/ped counts here: [Caltrans link.] If you use another form of performance tracking, please share here. |
| Operations & Maintenance | What Agency/Department will be responsible for ongoing Operations and Maintenance of the facility? | | | |
| BPAC Review | Has the local (city or county) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed this project and checklist? | | | Please include meeting date and BPAC comments. |

| Statement of Compliance | | NO | If NO, Please Describe Reasons (refer to Exemptions Clause) |
|--|--|----|--|
| The proposed project complies with all applicable Complete Streets policies and laws. | | | |
| The project includes segments of the Regional AT Network and will provide facilities that meets All Ages and Abilities design [principles. | | | |
| Does the project include a transit stop/station or is it located along a bus route? | | | |

| Statement of Exemption | YES | Provide Documentation or Explanation |
|--|-----|--|
| The affected roadway is legally prohibited for use by bicyclists and/or pedestrians. | | |
| The costs of providing Complete Streets improvements are excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use (defined as more than 20 percent for Complete Streets elements of the total project cost). | | If claimed, the agency must include proportionate alternatives and still provide safe accommodation of vulnerable road users. |
| 3. There is a documented Alternative Plan to implement Complete Streets and/or on a nearby parallel route. | | Describe Alternative Plan/Project |
| 4. Conditions exist in which Complete Streets policy requirements cannot be met, such as fire and safety specifications, spatial conflicts on the roadway with transit, or environmental concerns such abutting conservation land or severe topological constraints. | | Describe condition(s) that prohibit implementation of CS policy requirements |

SIGNATURES

If an exemption is checked, a Public Works or Department of Transportation Director (or designee) is required to acknowledge and sign off on the exception.

Signature

Agency Director, Department Director (or designee)

If transit stop, station or route is checked, all affected transit operators (contact list found here (*link forthcoming*) are required to acknowledge coordination by signing below.

e-Signature

ATTACHMENT 1 – All Ages and Abilities and Guidelines

1. All Ages and Abilities

Designing for All Ages & Abilities, Contextual Guidance for High-Comfort Bicycle Facilities, National Association of Transportation Officials, December 2017

Projects on the AT Network shall incorporate design principles based on designing for "All Ages and AAbilities1," contextual guidance provided by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), and consistent with state and national best practices. A facility that serves "all ages and abilities" is one that effectively serves the mobility needs of children, older adults, and people with disabilities and in doing so, works for everyone else. The all ages and abilities approach also strives to serve all users, regardless of age, ability, ethnicity, race, sex, income, or disability, by embodying national and international best practices related to traffic calming, speed reduction, and roadway design to increase user safety and comfort. This approach also includes the use of traffic calming elements or facilities separated from motor vehicle traffic, both of which can offer a greater feeling of safety and appeal to a wider spectrum of the public.

Using the "All Ages and Abilities" design principles on the AT Network, projects should optimize comfort and safety, acknowledge context sensitivity, prioritize safety and regional connectivity, and encourage access to transit.

Design best practices for safe street crossings, pedestrian and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility at transit stops, and bicycle/micromobility2 facilities on the AT Network should be incorporated throughout the entirety of the project. The Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG)3 by the U.S. Access Board should also be referenced during design.

| Contextual Guidance for Selecting All Ages & Abilities Bikeways | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Roadway Context | | | | | |
| Target Motor Vehicle Speed [*] Target Max. Motor Vehicle Volume (ADT) | | Motor Vehicle Lanes | Key Operational Considerations | All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility | |
| Any | | Any | Any of the following: high curbside activity, frequent buses, motor vehicle congestion, or turning conflicts [‡] | Protected Bicycle Lane | |
| < 10 mph | Less relevant | No centerline, | Pedestrians share the roadway | Shared Street | |
| ≤ 20 mph | ≤ 1,000 - 2,000 | or single lane one-way | < 50 motor vehicles per hour in | Bicvcle Boulevard | |
| | ≤ 500 – 1,500 | one nay | the peak direction at peak hour | Bicycle Boolevard | |
| | ≤ 1,500 – 3,000 | or single tarie | | Conventional or Buffered Bicycle Lane, or Protected Bicycle Lane | |
| ≤ 25 mph | ≤ 3,000 – 6,000 | | Low curbside activity, or low | Buffered or Protected Bicycle Lane | |
| | Greater than 6,000 | | one-way congestion pressure | congestion pressure | |
| | Any | Multiple lanes per direction | | Protected Bicycle Lane | |
| | ≤ 6,000 | each (≤ 6,000 Multip | Single lane each direction | | Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce Speed |
| Greater than 26 mph† | | | Multiple lanes per direction | Low curbside activity, or low congestion pressure | Protected Bicycle Lane, or Reduce to Single Lane & Reduce Speed |
| | Greater than 6,000 | Any | Any | Protected Bicycle Lane, or Bicycle Path | |
| 0 11 1 1 | High-speed limited access roadways, natural corridors, | | High pedestrian volume | Bike Path with Separate Walkway or Protected Bicycle Lane | |
| or geographic edge conditions with limited conflicts | | Any | Low pedestrian volume | Shared-Use Path or Protected Bicycle Lane | |

2. Design Guidance

Examples of applicable design guidance documents include (but are not limited to): American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) - *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets, Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities; Public Rightof-Way Accessibility Guide* (PROWAG); *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD); *Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines* (ADAAG); National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) - Urban Bikeway Design Guide.