

Summary of Changes

VDOT's "Traffic Calming Guide for Neighborhood Streets"

September 23, 2018 (revises November 2017 version)

VDOT's previous (November 2017 version) of the "Traffic Calming Guide for Neighborhood Streets" was revised effective September 23, 2018. A discussion on the reasons for the various revisions and the resulting changes to the Guide are outlined in this document.

The September 23, 2018 "Traffic Calming Guide for Neighborhood Streets" is available on VDOT's external website at the link below.

<https://www.virginia.gov/programs/resources/Traffic-Calming-Guide-For-Neighborhood-Streets.pdf>

The previous, November, 2017 version of the "Traffic Calming Guide for Neighborhood Streets" is also available on VDOT's external website at the link below.

https://www.virginia.gov/programs/resources/Traffic_Calming_Guide_For_Neighborhood_Streets_November_2017.pdf

Revisions to VDOT's "Traffic Calming Guide for Neighborhood Streets" (November 2017 Version).

Recent efforts by VDOT and certain localities to apply the November 2017 version of the Traffic Calming Guide resulted in a number of questions/issues that pointed to the need to clarify the traffic calming process and requirements as well as the role of the Locality and VDOT in the process. Other issues were raised that pointed to the need to make the Guide less prescriptive, provide leeway to the community/Locality in guiding the process and to limit VDOT's involvement where appropriate.

The changes made to the Guide to address these various issues are below. (Note: **items in boldface** reference specific topics in the Guide).

1. Regarding the **roles of the Locality and VDOT** in the various steps of the traffic calming process, the updated Guide clarifies the roles (p. 1) and emphasizes that that the Locality staff takes the overall lead in guiding and implementing the traffic calming process and plan development (Steps 1 – 6).

The Guide also clarifies that VDOT's role, to confirm the eligibility and feasibility of streets proposed for traffic calming and the proposed plan (Steps 1, 3 and 4) and coordinate the implementation of the plan (Steps 7 and 8).

2. The reference to **establishment of a Task Force Member group** is restated to more loosely state the Locality coordinates with the local community, HOA, CA etc. to develop the plan, in order to make this non-prescriptive as was originally intended.
3. The **definition of “Neighborhood Street”** under the eligibility requirements (p. 4) removes the previous distinction that residences are “connected to the street by driveways.”
4. When **developing the traffic calming plan**, the following is added:
 - a. Emphasizes that APPENDIX I: Development & Implementation of the Traffic Calming Plan is to be followed when developing the plan.
 - b. Also emphasizes the need to **consult the local Fire/Rescue Chief** regarding the proposed plan and the use of streets by fire and rescue vehicles etc.
 - c. Clarifies that **affected property owners** may agree with placement of a device near their property without agreeing with the entire plan.
5. The Guide substantially revises the **processes for determining community support** (step 5) to make it less prescriptive and cumbersome as follows:
 - a. Removes the specific requirement for a ballot survey to more loosely state “The Locality conducts a petition, survey, or other process that ensures the accurate measure and documentation of support.” This provides flexibility in letting the Locality determine the best approach to determine community support.
 - b. The items to be sent for the community for consideration when determining community support is more clearly defined to indicate the required mapping (not necessarily a tax map as before) and items displayed (e.g. streets, location/footprint of traffic calming devices, affected residences and the survey area) information on features of proposed devices and the process for determining community support.
 - c. The measure (vote/survey etc.) of community support is limited to the survey area with the previous references and requirements for “ballot survey area” and “impacted area” removed.
 - d. The previous “community voting rules” and stipulations are condensed to a few simple requirements that each occupied residence or business gets a single signature or ballot/vote that indicates approval / disapproval of the entire plan etc.
 - e. The requirement for approval of the plan changes from 60% to “more than 50%” of the survey area and, the minimum required community voting/participation rate removed entirely. Previously the requirement for approval was 60% with a minimum voting/participation rate of 50%, potentially resulting in an approved plan where only 30% of the community

indicating their approval. As revised, more than 50% of the community must approve the proposal in order to proceed.

6. Restates the **requirements for the BOS resolution** to more clearly indicate and define the required elements (e.g. statement that the plan was properly presented to the community, the source of funding etc.).
7. Clarifies the **items that should accompany the submittal of the plan to VDOT** (e.g. BOS resolution, engineering review, map of survey area, survey documentation).
8. Under "Funding" clarifies that secondary or locality-provided funds are the **primary sources for funding**.
9. Lessens the stipulations that a Locality must follow for the **modification of installed measures** where there is no safety, maintenance or operational issue to require only that they use their secondary or local funds, secure (re)approval of the affected residents and confirm the proposed changes with VDOT. Previously they were also required to go through all the relevant steps of the process including; conduct another survey/petition to measure community support and get BOS / Town Council endorsement.