



COMPLETE STREETS COMPLIANCE FORM

This form is used to document the process in which MaineDOT considers the needs of all users of the transportation system in the planning and development of projects to meet the spirit and intent of MaineDOT's Complete Streets Policy. The information determined by completing this form, in addition to on-going communication, will help to ensure proper compliance with the policy. The on-going communication shall include: early planning and documentation to identify needs; a discussion of Complete Streets opportunities at Team Meetings; and other documentation including comments in Projex and within the preliminary Design Report (PDR).

The Complete Streets Policy applies to all new construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and maintenance projects funded partially or in full through MaineDOT, and includes projects programmed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) or through the department's Local Project Administration Program. Examples of applicable projects include, but are not limited to, bridge, highway, intersection, safety, transit, lane and shoulder widths/markings during paving, privately initiated projects, and new-capacity street and highway projects.

PROJECT AND LOCATION INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE:		WIN:	
PROJECT SCOPE:		PROJECT MANAGER:	

COMPLETE STREETS EXEMPTIONS

(See Instructions on page 4 for the Guidelines in determining exemptions.)

- ☐ The use of the transportation facility by pedestrians, bicyclists or other users is prohibited by law.
- ☐ The cost of incorporating any complete streets principles is disproportionate to the need or probable use.
- ☐ Incorporating any complete streets principles is outside the scope of the subject project due to its very nature.

Please provide a short explanation justification below if any of the boxes under "Exemption" are checked. If the project is exempt, please complete the signature section.

--

COMPLETE STREETS PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

(The following are typical types of complete streets practices that may be incorporated into a project. This list below is not all inclusive and other practices may be determined as a project is planned or developed.)

Complete Streets Principle/Practice	Warranted and Feasible (to be Incorporated in the Project)	Not Warranted	Not Feasible
Sidewalks: installation, repair, ramps, railing, etc.	☐	☐	☐
Crosswalks: installation, repair, markings, etc.	☐	☐	☐
Lighting: street or pedestrian scale	☐	☐	☐
Signals and Signage: bike and pedestrian features	☐	☐	☐
Streetscaping: benches, bulb-outs, landscaping, etc.	☐	☐	☐
Pavement Improvements: replacement, repair, etc.	☐	☐	☐
Shoulder Improvements: widen, new pavement	☐	☐	☐
Bike/Shared Use: paths, lanes, etc.	☐	☐	☐
Public Transit: bus stops, bus pull-outs, kiosks, etc.	☐	☐	☐
ADA Accommodations: ramps, cross-slope, etc.	☐	☐	☐
Signage:	☐	☐	☐
Restriping:	☐	☐	☐
Reducing Travel Lane Widths:	☐	☐	☐
Other Non-Widening Options:	☐	☐	☐
Other:	☐	☐	☐
Other:	☐	☐	☐
Other:	☐	☐	☐
Other:	☐	☐	☐
Other:	☐	☐	☐

Principles and Practices – Not Warranted

Please provide a short explanation/justification below for the boxes checked under “Not Warranted”. This may include any of the following which should be checked here if applicable:

- ☐ Current and future low use, low population density, or limited public support
- ☐ Substantial public opposition exists

Principles and Practices – Not Feasible

Please provide a short explanation/justification below for the boxes checked under “Not Feasible”. This may include any of the following which should be checked here if applicable:

- ☐ Engineering, financial, or environmental constraints exist
- ☐ Local financial commitment to construct and maintain is insufficient (if applicable)

APPROVAL AND FILING

The Project Manager shall be conferring with the Active Transportation Planner and/or the Regional Planner throughout the development of the project. The concurrence of Planning should be obtained prior to the PDR. A

Planning Concurrence

☐ I DO concur with the findings in this document	☐ I DO NOT concur with the findings in this document and request a Coachpoint.
--	--

Active Transportation Planner/Regional Planner

Date: [Click here to enter a date](#)

Bureau Approval

☐ I DO approve the findings in this document	☐ I DO NOT approve with the findings in this document
--	---

Program Manager

Date: [Click here to enter a date](#)

INSTRUCTIONS/GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETE STREETS COMPLIANCE FORM

GENERAL INFORMATION

This form along with these instructions/guidelines will consist of one way to comply with our Complete Streets Policy. In addition to the information here, it is expected that Complete Streets should be discussed early and often throughout the planning and development of a project. In those cases where Planning staff are already aware of a need or a concern that information should be shared with project Development staff. This could be in the form of meetings or discussions along with any already listed add-on candidates in Projex within the area that could be addressed through the project. Complete Streets should be an item to be discussed at all Team Meetings to ensure that it is properly being addressed along with discussions with the Active Transportation Planner. Those interactions will help to properly complete this form and more importantly, to make sure we comply fully with our policy.

PROJECT AND LOCATION INFORMATION

Project TITLE: Name of project in the work plan

WIN: MaineDOT Work Identification Number

Project Scope: Type of project i.e. "mill and fill" or "intersection safety improvements"

Project Manager: MaineDOT Project Manager submitting the form

COMPLETE STREETS EXEMPTIONS

These exemptions will only be rarely used.

- The first exemption, "the use of the transportation facility by pedestrians, bicyclists or other users is prohibited by law" will only be applicable in very specific cases such as the interstate and other type areas.
- The second exemption, "the cost of incorporating any complete streets principles is disproportionate to the need or probable use" would only be used if there was no need or current or anticipated use. This would be rarely used and only in areas where it is concurred by the Active Transportation Planner after reviewing current data and potential future uses.
- The third exemption, "Incorporating any complete streets principles is outside the scope of the subject project due to its very nature", would be for very small and limited projects that by their nature would not need additional review for Complete Streets.

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES

This section list various principles or practices that may be incorporated in a project to comply with Complete Streets. The list is not all inclusive since there may be certain specific elements that could be incorporated in specific projects. Any of those elements could be evaluated based on needs or concerns raised by the public, municipality, and/or Planning staff. Coordination with the Active transportation planner and other Planning staff will help to address these needs. Please check off the appropriate check box (or boxes) for each description:

Warranted and Feasible: This is a principle or practice that can and should be incorporated into the project.

Not Warranted: This box would be checked for the item if there is no current or future need or if there is limited public support or even public opposition for the specific item. This is different than the exemption that states, "the cost of incorporating any complete streets principles is disproportionate to the need or probable use". In that case no complete streets principles are needed based on it being disproportionate to the needs or use. Checking off "Not Warranted" means this specific item is not warranted based on current or future need, while other items may be warranted. An example could be that there is limited or no pedestrian use while there is bicycle use. In that case sidewalks would not be warranted while shoulder improvements and other items may be warranted.

Not Feasible: This relates to principles or practices that may or may not be warranted but that would not be feasible to do based primarily on engineering, financial, or environmental constraints.

Still needs work. Cost % ?, Elements applicable (and not) to certain scopes?

